

## SENATE—Wednesday, April 21, 1993

(Legislative day of Monday, April 19, 1993)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable BYRON L. DORGAN, a Senator from North Dakota.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Gracious Father in Heaven, through Jeremiah the Prophet You asked the question, what evil have your fathers found in Me that they have gone from following after Me and have followed after vanity and become vain?

Our hearts are heavy this morning with the tragedy, the immeasurable tragedy in Waco, and we find it difficult to understand a leader like this and people who will follow a leader like this. And yet we realize, with G.K. Chesterton, that the danger in not following God is that we will believe not in nothing but believe anything. We are incurably religious. We must have some God that we follow, and if not the true God, then a substitute.

Help us to realize, Lord, that there is a sense in which each of us, if we are not following the true God, are believing in something less, and help us to order our lives against the truth of Jeremiah, that we may follow the true God and become like Him. We pray this in Jesus' name. Amen.

## APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DORGAN. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, April 21, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BYRON L. DORGAN, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. DORGAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, the Senator from Maine.

## SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, this morning there will be a period for morning business until 9:45 a.m., at which time the Senate will return to consideration of H.R. 1335, the emergency jobs bill, where there will be 1 hour for debate only, followed by a cloture vote on the bill, as amended, at 10:45 a.m.

So all Senators and their staffs, those responsible for the Senate schedule, should be aware that a rollover vote on a motion to invoke cloture on the emergency jobs bill, as amended, will occur at 10:45 a.m. this morning.

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve all of my leader time and I reserve all of the time of the distinguished Republican leader, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leadership time is reserved.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 9:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

## REACHING A COMPROMISE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition in morning business to speak in opposition to the motion to invoke cloture, which motion I believe will fail, and then to urge that serious efforts be undertaken to find a compromise between the President's position and the position articulated in the Hatfield-Dole amendment.

Mr. President, as I have expressed on this floor, I do not believe there is a need for an emergency appropriations bill because in each of the accounts requested by the President there are unspent funds. The President has the authority, as President, to accelerate that expenditure vastly in excess of the \$19 billion originally contemplated. But in a spirit of compromise, I have supported the Hatfield-Dole amend-

ment because I believe it is very important the American people see that this Chamber is not in gridlock. The proposal of \$6 billion offered yesterday by Senator HATFIELD, which I spoke about, is a realistic starting point for a compromise.

The President's position is at \$15 billion, and it is my hope that if, as, and when—and I believe it will—the cloture motion fails, there will be a serious attempt by the leadership of this body to try to work out a compromise.

Mr. President, I think it is apparent that the spirit of the country is not really in support of the President's stimulus package. On Senator HATFIELD's amendment yesterday, four Democrats joined the Republicans. On the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, five Democrats voted against the measure. It was a 52-to-46 vote and with two Republicans absent it would have been 52 to 48.

Mr. President, the calls which I have received in my Pennsylvania offices and in Washington have run strongly against the President's measure. As it is well known, the President traveled to Pittsburgh, PA, last Saturday and urged Pennsylvanians to urge me to support his program, and I said immediately, when I learned that he was traveling there, that I was opposed to his program on the merits.

I have introduced the statistics on calls to my Pennsylvania offices and to Washington, and for the full day on Monday, April 19, they ran 1,234 against the President's package, 372 in favor, and in Pittsburgh the tally was 566 against and 118 in favor.

The full day yesterday, April 20, showed a total of 649 opposed to the President's package, 298 in favor; and in Pittsburgh, 237 opposed the President and 104 favored the President. So that the statistics are very decisive against the President's position.

It has been a surprise to this Senator that we have not seen any national polls, which seem to come out on about every subject under the Sun, as to where the people stand on the President's package.

Yesterday, at the conclusion of the vote, I urged my Republican colleagues to move for an accommodation and a compromise. This morning, Mr. President, I telephoned President Clinton before 8 o'clock. I found he was jogging and talked instead to White House officials. I urged the President to call in Senator MITCHELL and Senator DOLE after the cloture vote, assuming the cloture vote fails.

It is my position as articulated to a White House official this morning that it is time to try to reach a compromise.

It is unconscionable, Mr. President, that we should not have immediate legislation to extend unemployment compensation benefits for \$4 billion. This Senator was one of a handful of Republicans who voted for that many weeks ago. I said at the time I would prefer to pay for it, but if it cannot be paid for I would support it even though it could not be paid for.

When we reached the figures on the Hatfield amendment yesterday with \$2 billion in addition—and I shall not repeat what I said yesterday—this Senator might have supported a little more, and I did support more on high-way funding last year. The \$450 million added by Senator HATFIELD on summer jobs is a significant step forward. It is close to the \$500 million in emergency funding we put up last year for summer jobs. There is really no end to how much you can do and how many people you can hire. But I think that the Hatfield amendment is a good starting point from where the President's package is for the President to convene the two leaders of this body and try to knock some heads and try to work out a compromise.

The most important factor as I see it, Mr. President, is that the American people should not think that we are at loggerheads, at logjam and in gridlock, but that the leaders in Washington, DC—it is a Senate matter now, and it is a White House matter now. And if the Chief Executive of this country, President Clinton, calls in the two leaders, Senator MITCHELL and Senator DOLE, and seeks a compromise as a last ditch effort to work this out, I think the interests of America would be served.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum from my staff on the phone call receipts be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MEMORANDUM

To: Barry Caldwell and Doug Loon.  
From: Jill Schugardt.  
Date: April 19, 1993, 5:00 p.m.  
Subject: Constituent totals in response to the President's stimulus package.

	Against the stimulus package	For the stimulus package
Monday calls:		
Washington .....	369	122
Philadelphia .....	90	61
Pittsburgh .....	566	118
Harrisburg .....	85	28
Scranton/Wilkes-Barre .....	79	34
Allentown .....	45	9
Total .....	1,234	372

#### MEMORANDUM

To: Barry Caldwell and Doug Loon.  
From: Jill Schugardt.  
Date: April 20, 1993, 5:00 p.m.

Subject: Constituent tallies.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

	Against the stimulus package	For the stimulus package
Washington .....	251	88
Philadelphia .....	57	63
Pittsburgh .....	237	104
Harrisburg .....	27	15
Scranton/Wilkes-Barre .....	37	19
Allentown .....	40	9
Total .....	649	298

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I see my colleagues on the floor. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senator from Texas is to be recognized for the remainder of morning business.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my colleague, if he has a fairly short statement.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thought I had some time reserved in morning business as well. I was going to use my 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would advise that it is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Texas is reserved time and was to consume the remainder of morning business.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Did I have some time reserved?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa did not, at least according to the information the Chair has.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Then I should not have been seeking the floor.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I will try to be brief and then yield what time I have left to our colleague from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM].

#### THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we are going to be debating very shortly the economic stimulus package.

I have had an opportunity to speak at some length on this subject. I thought I would sum up my views in morning business, and leave time available for other Senators who want to speak.

The real issue in the so-called economic stimulus package has to do with one fundamental question, and that question is: Can we create jobs by raising the deficit and spending money? That is the fundamental question. If I believed that raising the deficit another \$16 billion so that we might put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work without doing a corresponding amount of damage to the economy, and putting out of work a similar number or perhaps a greater number of people, then I would support the President's economic stimulus package.

The President would have us believe that all we need to do to create prosperity in America is raise the deficit by another \$16 billion, and let the administration spend that money creating jobs.

There is a fundamental disagreement in the U.S. Senate about whether or not deficit spending can create new jobs. I ask my colleagues: If deficit spending is an economic stimulus that creates jobs, then why with the largest deficit in the history of our great country do we not have full employment? If 300 billion dollars' worth of deficit spending has not created full employment, if \$300 billion worth of deficit spending is not sufficient stimulus, how is another \$16 billion of deficit spending going to do the job?

I think the clear answer to the question is that the \$300 billion of deficit spending we have today is an impediment to both job creation and economic growth.

About one-half of all the savings by all Americans is not going to build new homes, new farms, new factories this year. Instead, it is being siphoned off to pay for Government deficit spending. We have a capital shortage in the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to go home and listen to small-business people talk about how they want to borrow money to expand their businesses, to create new jobs, and how they are having a difficult time getting that money. If we borrow another \$16 billion and spend the money, that \$16 billion that might have built new homes, new businesses, new factories, and new farms will instead be spent by the Federal Government.

So the fundamental issue is this: Does deficit spending create prosperity? President Clinton and the economic stimulus package says yes. I say no. And I think the experience of our Nation and the experience of all nations that have followed the path of trying to spend their way to prosperity suggests that deficit spending does not create prosperity. The fundamental issue is this: Should we increase spending? The Democrats and the President say yes. Republicans say no net new spending. Should we raise the deficit? The Democrats say yes. The Republicans say no.

#### IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt stood at \$4,253,000,590,694.58 as of the close of business on Monday, April 19, averaging out to be a \$16,557.72 per capita share for every man, woman and child in America.

#### THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, April 24 is the day we commemorate the hor-



rors visited upon the Armenian Community in Turkey during World War I and afterward. On this day, we show solidarity with Armenians everywhere, and reflect upon the meaning and lessons of their suffering and sacrifice.

As many commentators have observed, the massacres and deportations inflicted upon the Armenians during that period were to mark this century of horrors. Civilian populations, defined by ethnic, racial or religious distinctiveness, have become targets of marauding soldiers or paramilitary groups, and in some cases, by sovereign states using all their instruments of military power to destroy a people.

But reflecting upon the fate of the Armenian people in this century is by no means one-sidedly glum. Like the Phoenix of mythology, the Armenian people survived its bleakest days and arose with renewed vigor. Armenians' sense of national identity has been strengthened and the Armenian language is flourishing. Most important, independent Armenian statehood has been restored to guarantee the security and future of the Nation.

Independent Armenia has endured many trials during its brief tenure, and its relations with its neighbors—also newly independent—are troubled. The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has caused thousands of deaths and turned hundreds of thousands into refugees. Energy blockades have meant four dark and freezing winters, hungry children, and a growing sense of isolation. Nor are there any indications of a speedy end to this conflict. Yet the longer the hostilities continue, the more victims there will be. In the memory of those who have perished since 1988, as well as those killed during World War I, we must do everything we can to bring this conflict to an end, so that the process of normalization among the peoples of Trans-Caucasia can begin.

It is sadly fitting that the commemoration of the Armenian genocide should coincide with the opening of the Holocaust Museum in Washington. For the basic lesson of the horrifying experiences of these two peoples in this century is: "Never again." This is a lesson we must all take to heart as the war in the former Yugoslavia continues, and Bosnia's Moslem civilian population is bombed, shelled, massacred, and deported. The fate of peoples belonging to these three different religions in this century—Armenian Christians, European Jews, and Bosnian Moslems—demonstrates the oneness of the human community and the universality of the lesson of their suffering. If the international community ignores slaughter, its perpetrators will be emboldened. Let April 24 instead inspire us to show our solidarity with the victims and our condemnation of the slaughterers.

#### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 78th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. We are all aware of the tragic details. On April 24, 1915, 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople, exiled, or taken to the interior and murdered. Similar measures were pursued throughout the Ottoman empire in Armenian centers. Thus began the 8 years of the Armenians' tragedy. When the horror ended in 1923, 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children had been killed and another half million forced to flee their homeland.

Sadly, though this was the first occurrence of genocide in the 20th century, it regrettably has not been the last. The Armenian tragedy was followed by the horrors of the Holocaust, the massacre of Cambodians, and even today the scourge of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia. It is extremely disheartening that on a day when we remember the Armenian genocide, and within a week of the dedication of the Holocaust museum, the reality of genocide is still with us, its Bosnian victims appearing nightly on our TV screens.

Today is the day when we commemorate the victims of the Armenian genocide, innocents exterminated simply because of their national origin. My purpose today is not simply to acknowledge and commemorate the Armenian martyrs of genocide; my larger goal is to hold this history up as a warning to Americans today as well as future generations and world leaders yet unborn. We can best serve the memory of the victims of genocides in the past by doing everything possible to prevent such tragedy in the future.

It is often said that those who forget the past are doomed to repeat its mistakes. I pray that we will honor the Armenian genocide victims by rededicating ourselves, as individuals and as a Nation, to ensuring that tragedies like that visited upon Armenians nearly 80 years ago never happen again, and that people of all races, nationalities, ethnic groups and religions enjoy the basic human rights which are their due as human beings.

#### ARMENIAN MASSACRES OF 1894, 1909, AND 1915-23

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the horrendous massacres of Armenians in Ottoman Turkey in 1894, 1909, and 1915-23.

Mr. President, the Armenians have suffered brutal persecution throughout their 3,000-year history. The most tragic of these injustices occurred within the past 100 years. In the 1890's, 300,000 Armenians were killed under the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid II. By 1909, over 21,000 Armenians had been slaughtered in Cilicia.

By World War I, the stage had been set for an organized, well-plotted massacre of the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire: from 1915 to 1923, almost the entire Armenian population was systematically removed from their homes. One and one-half million were murdered, and more than half a million were exiled. About 2½ million Armenians were living in the Ottoman Empire on the eve of the First World War. After the bloody campaigns to expel them, less than 100,000 remained in Turkey.

The U.S. Government has rightfully denounced these horrors. The American people have been generous in aiding Armenian survivors. Congress has designated days of remembrance for those who perished in the massacres.

Today in the former Soviet Union, war has again brought suffering to the Armenian people. Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh are suffering the consequences of a bloody ethnic conflict, deprived of electricity, food, gas, and medicine. In addition, the country is trying to recover from the massive earthquake which demolished it in 1988. All this, as Armenia itself—once again an independent nation—is constructing its democracy and establishing its statehood.

Mr. President, I can only hope that we have learned from the lessons of the past. As I think about the Armenian massacres in 1894, 1909, and 1915-23, I find myself using the same words we are using today regarding the genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina. It is because of tragedies such as those in Armenian history that mandate a stronger, more just response to the aggression in the former Yugoslavia.

I am sure that the strong American-Armenian friendship will endure. I am pleased that the independent Republic of Armenia has been recognized worldwide. And I hope that with international support it can become not only a strong democracy, but also a haven to protect the victims of ages of abuse.

#### WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, for the past several days events have been held around the world marking the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, which began the first night of Passover, April 19, 1943.

Fifty years ago last Saturday, German SS Gen. Jurgen Stroop sent birthday greetings to his master Adolph Hitler with the triumphant message "the Jewish quarter in Warsaw is no more."

He had good reason to send such a message. The mightiest army to every bestride the European continent had been instructed to butcher the starving remnants of Europe's largest Jewish community. And yet for 19 bloody days the defenders of the ghetto fought off the armed might of Nazi Germany.

Fifty years ago this week, as the ghetto burned and war consumed much of Europe, I was a senior at Benjamin Franklin High School in Manhattan. It is fashionable today to suggest that Americans didn't know about the Warsaw ghetto or even about the Holocaust as it was unfolding—that it was some terrible dark secret that the world only discovered when Russian and American troops began to stumble over death camps in the war's closing months.

It is fashionable myth—and a convenient one. But we knew. Even seniors at Benjamin Franklin High School who read the New York Times knew.

On April 20, 1943, 50 years ago yesterday, the New York Times reported that 2,000,000 Jews had been murdered by the Nazis since the beginning of the war and that "more are in immediate danger of execution by lethal gas and shooting. Details of the methods by which others have been brutally murdered achieve a degree of horror which numbs the mind."

Two days later, on April 22, the Times reported on the front page, no less, that a clandestine radio broadcast from Poland had been monitored in Stockholm announcing that: "The last 35,000 Jews in the ghetto at Warsaw have been condemned to execution. \* \* \* The people are murdered. Women and children defend themselves with their naked arms. Save us." And then, the Times reported, the radio "suddenly went dead."

Fifty years ago, tanks slaughtered children in the streets of Warsaw. There was no military logic or geopolitical reasoning for these acts of wanton murder. Over 6 million Jewish civilians were slaughtered during the Second World War—not because of anything they did, but because of who they were.

Fifty years ago we knew what was happening and where it was happening. And today, 50 years later, we know what is happening and where it is happening. Let there be no misunderstanding. Genocide is being committed in the Balkans in 1993 as surely as it was committed, on a vast scale, in 1943.

The Members of the Senate will be pleased to know that our distinguished colleague Vice President GORE made a similar point at the largest North American ghetto commemorative event, held this past Sunday at Madison Square Garden. I was heartened by the Vice President's references to the genocide currently being carried out in Bosnia and by his firm promise that "judgment stands in the wings of history" for those who have sanctioned and ordered these actions.

I was also deeply moved on Sunday by the poignant opening remarks of Benjamin Meed, the chairman of the United States Commemoration Committee, which sponsors this annual gathering, and of his wife, Vladka Meed, who served with heroic distinc-

tion as a courier between the fighters in the Warsaw ghetto and the handful of Jewish partisans outside the ghetto walls during the uprising. I believe the Members of the Senate will be similarly interested in their remarks and ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### REMARKS BY BENJAMIN MEED

Once again we are here to remember our Six Million Kedomshim. But today we participate in a special event; we commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, the first organized civilian resistance in Nazi Europe. Even in our wildest dreams, none of us who survived dared to imagine that we would be part of such a gathering.

In April 1943—fifty years ago almost to the day—I stood outside the walls of the Warsaw Ghetto. Guns and grenades thundered, setting the ghetto ablaze, as people went about their day-to-day affairs. I watched in disbelief as a merry-go-round turned to the joy of my Polish neighbors, oblivious to the tragedy nearby. Inside the ghetto walls—the stench of death and cries for help; outside—the music of a carousel and normal life.

To this day, the scene haunts me. How was it possible for people to act "normally," while Jews burned inside the ghetto walls?

It is this memory—not just of the perpetrators, who pulled the trigger and bear eternal responsibility for their deeds and the machinery of extermination, but of the bystanders in Warsaw and elsewhere—which still tears at my very soul. Millions of Jews, betrayed and abandoned, were slaughtered as our neighbors went about their usual business and the world stood by.

The Holocaust is uniquely a Jewish tragedy. Elie Wiesel put it this way: "While not all victims were Jews, all Jews were victims." We know that millions who were not Jews perished during the war and we mourn for them as well.

But our Jewish children were the first taken, the first beaten, the first gassed. And our people—the Jewish people—were Hitler's chosen target. In this, we had no equal partners.

No one will ever see what passed before our eyes; no one can understand the terror that gripped our bodies; no one can know the unspeakable acts that we saw man to be capable of. Yet today, almost daily, we hear the gruesome echo of the Nazi legacy of hatred and murder played out somewhere around the globe.

Our tragic past has taught us that the unthinkable is possible. For us, it is impossible to ignore the fear that history can repeat itself. We must join with each other; for no Jew can survive if all Jews do not care for one another. How different would the course of history have been if Israel, ready to protect the safety and dignity of every oppressed Jew, existed half a century ago. Thus, in remembering our history, we express solidarity with the State of Israel and its people, whose security is as precious to us as the air we breathe.

While still blessed with life, we survivors will continue to gather to tell and retell—what was done to us, how we lived, and how we resisted.

Those of us fortunate enough to live through the Holocaust adopted a kind of hymn of survival: *Mir zeynen do!* We are here!

We are here—To honor the Six Million;

We are here—To pay tribute to the resistance fighters of Warsaw and elsewhere;

We are here—To remember and not let others forget. *Mir zeynen do!*

#### REMARKS OF VLADKA MEED, COURIER OF WARSAW GHETTO UNDERGROUND Z.O.B.

Fifty years have passed and I can still see the Warsaw Ghetto uprising before my eyes—the flames from the Jewish houses leaping over the ghetto walls and through the clouds of thick smoke, I can still hear the sounds of explosions and the firing of Jewish guns. In its glare I see my people of Warsaw, Lodz, Vilno, Riga, of all the other ghettos and towns. I see them on every road of their tormented life under the Nazis.

Today we know more precisely about the clinical aspects of the enemy's murder machine, of the participation of its industry, its science, its people, in the planned killings. All this is known today, but the world still knows little about the daily life, the struggle and resistance of those who were murdered.

I recall the crowded Warsaw Ghetto streets with starving people, children swollen from hunger, begging for a crumb of bread, corpses lying unclaimed on the sidewalks. I remember my neighbor standing in the doorway of the building watching out for approaching Germans, while upstairs, her daughter held secret classes for children. I recall the illegal schools in the ghetto, the secret libraries, clandestine synagogues, yeshivas, secret cultural events, the political youth groups with their illegal activities and publications. Yes, beyond the horrible suffering, typhoid epidemic, terror and death, there was life pulsating in the ghetto—a life filled with meaning, with dignity and even with hope.

This was resistance with a will to survive as a people and a spirit that refused to be crushed. This was the soil in which the seeds of our later form of armed resistance took hold. But as we know, dying from starvation, from persecution, was too slow a pace for the Germans—they had different plans—the final solution. The carefully coordinated Nazi machinery of mass murder went into operation.

I still see them, our people, among them my dearest ones, filled with fear of the unknown, walking silently, under pointed rifles, to the trains. As their footsteps echo in my mind, I can still hear their unuttered outcry to the world which let this happen. Yet, even then, many still nourished the hope against hope that they will survive.

How could our people, who for generations believed and cherished human values, imagine such evil as that of an enemy who planned our total annihilation? How could we grasp right away the scope of such a huge apparatus installed and supported by trained military death squads?

Let us remember that even during those trying times, when the world closed its eyes in order not to see the smoke of the crematoria, our people struggled to remain "Mentchen", to preserve their belief in humanity, in G'd. In Estonia, camp inmates secretly observed Yom Kippur and organized prayer groups. In Varvara Camp, illegal cultural gatherings took place. Even in the pit of Hell, in Auschwitz, surrounded by the smell of burning flesh, members of the Sonder Commando buried notes and testimonies next to the ovens, so that if everyone perished, the written word would still tell what happened to them.

The hundreds of thousands who were deported, paved the way for further action. Their deeds hammered into the minds of those left behind in the ghetto the brutal truth of mass killings—a truth brought back



by victims who somehow escaped death. Then, the last stage of resistance, the determination to die fighting, came into its own.

The coordinated Jewish Fighters Organization was formed and expressed the will and the feelings of the remaining Warsaw Ghetto Jews. Its core was our remaining youth from the illegal political organizations; the Zionists, Socialists, Bundists, Communists and others. They, the young, were at the forefront of the Jewish struggle everywhere. The historic, decisive role of these idealistic young ghetto people has yet to be fully told. It was my destiny to work with them, to see their determination, their spirit, their commitment to undertake the last, unequal fight. None of the young expected to survive an attack on the Germans, nor did they, in the smallest way, expect to influence the war. Nevertheless, a profound conviction that the cause was just, drove us on.

But how do we get arms? This was our biggest concern. The ghetto had no arms. We turned to the outside world, to the Polish underground, the response was pitiful. We had to find our own way. I recall the primitive factories which our armament engineer Michael Klepfisz set up in ghetto attics, with the young preparing Molotov cocktails, learning how to handle guns, the smuggling of dynamite over the ghetto wall.

On my missions from the Polish side to the ghetto, I could hear the sounds of hammering. Jews were building bunkers, hiding places. Bakers secretly supplied bread for the fighting groups. Money and jewelry were collected for armaments—"Resist, don't let yourself be taken away," was the call of the ghetto.

The hour struck, April 19, 1943, when German soldiers marched in full gear, into the Warsaw Ghetto to make it "Judenrein" (devoid of Jews). The streets were empty. Suddenly, at certain intersections, they came under fire. From buildings, from windows, from rooftops of houses, the Jews were shooting. The Germans withdrew. They set up artillery around ghetto walls and from there they systematically bombarded the ghetto houses. Still, the ghetto did not yield. One of the units, at the entrance to the brush makers factory, waited with anticipation for the approaching Germans. When the first soldiers started to enter, a silent signal from the commander, and a moment later, a loud explosion. It was one of the four mines which went off; we were so poorly equipped. Inexperienced, untrained civilians fought against a well-armed Wehrmacht with tanks, artillery and planes. Block after block, house after house, were set on fire by the Germans. The fire that swept the ghetto, turned night into day. The flames, the heat, the suffocating smoke, drove the people from their hiding places. Men, women and children jumped out of windows and ran through burning ruins, looking for a place where they could breathe. But, where could they go when everything around them was burning? And in the midst of this flaming hell, the fighting went on, until the ghetto was reduced to charred rubble.

The German General, Jurgen Stroop, who destroyed the Warsaw Ghetto, stated in an official report that on May 16, after four weeks of struggle, he ordered the remaining synagogue on Tiomacka Street to be blown up as a sign of his victory over the fighting ghetto. We know, of course, that after that time the ghetto was unable to continue resistance, since the majority of our military organization had been killed. Mordechai Anielewicz, leader of the uprising, and his staff were gassed at Mila 18. Many others

were burned to death. But for many weeks afterwards, shots from the ghetto were still heard.

Those final days united them all. Those who were deported, those who had fallen with arms in their hands, those who were gassed and those who suffocated in the smoldering ruins; they were all united in the long chain of resistance.

During the days of the uprising, our representatives on the Polish side sent radio messages to the Polish government in exile in London. We pleaded for arms, for help, but in vain. Our people, who put so much hope in the free world, were entirely alone, forsaken in their final hours. True, a war was going on, battles were being fought on many fronts, but the war against us Jews was entirely overlooked.

Only one year later, I was in the uprising of Polish Warsaw. I remember at that time, the planes flying over the city dropping arms and medical supplies for the Polish fighters. But when the Jews of the ghetto fought, the skies above were empty.

In the months afterward we learned of organized Jewish uprisings in other ghettos and camps, of Jewish partisan fighting in the forests. Our people resisted the enemy in all possible ways till the end. Only the resistance at different times took on different forms.

We now stand at a distance from the shattering times in the ghetto of Warsaw, from events, which shaped our lives and reshaped history. And standing at a distance we look back and remember. The story of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising doomed from the start, must remain a ringing warning and an inspiration to all people in all times.

#### CDBG WEEK

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, while the Senate was in recess, communities around the Nation celebrated the success of the Community Development Block Grant Program, the largest Federal assistance program which provides services to local communities. I want to take this opportunity to honor the CDBG Program and those who help administer it in Massachusetts and across the country.

During this time of economic struggle in Massachusetts, when we are seeing major cutbacks in local aid, the CDBG Program provides our cities and towns funding for critical services. It funds such diverse needs as the revitalization of commercial districts, housing improvement loans, aid to small- and medium-sized businesses, essential social programs such as day care, substance abuse treatment, and job creation services, repairing and replacing municipal water and sewer lines, repaving of streets and sidewalks, and modifications of public buildings to make them accessible, depending on local needs and local priorities. President Clinton, recognizing the importance of this program, has made it a central part of his economic stimulus package, which I support.

Many Republicans have attacked the program and are using it as an excuse to hold up the job-creating stimulus plan which contains some additional

funding for it. They are attacking it for what I consider its greatest strength: its administration through local municipalities. The effectiveness of the funds it provides has resulted largely from the fact that communities have had the freedom to choose where to apply the funds they receive rather than having the decision made by Federal bureaucrats in Washington.

We should use the occasion of CDBG Week to remind ourselves of the successes of the program and its importance. I, for one, support the CDBG Program wholeheartedly and will continue to work for additional funding for it in the future as I have since I entered the Senate 8 years ago.

#### NANCY MOORE THURMOND LEGISLATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that legislation designating April 17-24, 1994, as "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week," passed by the Senate on Monday, has now been passed by the House of Representatives.

Senator THURMOND recently wrote to me, thanking the Senate for adopting this legislation, and I thought it appropriate to share that letter with my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Senator THURMOND be entered in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, April 20, 1993.

Senator BOB DOLE,  
Office of the Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: My family and I would like to express our deep appreciation to you for introducing the Senate resolution designating the week of April 17-24, 1994 as the "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week".

As you know, the Thurmond family has strongly supported organ and tissue donor awareness for a number of years. In the midst of our sorrow over Nancy Moore's loss, my family and I have derived a great deal of comfort from knowing that even in death, she may be able to go on helping others by giving the precious gift of life to someone else's child.

Please express my thanks to the rest of our Senate colleagues as well. I can think of no more fitting memorial to my lovely daughter than one which encourages others to display the generosity of spirit which she had in such great measure.

Thank you again for your kindness and support during this very difficult time. The prayers and good wishes of our friends have been a great help to us all, and we appreciate your friendship more than we can say.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

#### RELATIONS WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support for and con-

fidence in the growing relations between the United States and the Republic of Korea. I am particularly proud of the efforts of officials in Yankton, SD, who are encouraging diplomatic efforts between my home State of South Dakota and the Republic of Korea.

I applaud the efforts of Mr. Milo Dailey, a Yankton, SD, resident, who will be traveling to the Republic of Korea as a liaison between the people and city government of Yankton and the people of the Republic of Korea. Milo's hard work, dedication, and sincerity are commendable. His efforts are designed to promote diplomacy and good will.

I support strong ties between cities in the United States and cities in foreign countries. Such grassroots local efforts establish foundations for stronger and more sound diplomatic relations at higher levels of government. I encourage the work of the Yankton, SD, Chamber of Commerce and their liaison, Milo Dailey, to foster stronger ties with the Republic of Korea.

The city of Yankton is a lovely city with much to offer. It is a fine example of a small, rural city willing to extend its warmth and charm abroad in promoting positive relations with a foreign country. I tip my hat to Yankton city residents and local government officials for offering their good fortune to people in the Republic of Korea. Mr. President, again I applaud the sincere endeavors of Milo Dailey and the people of Yankton, SD, as they embark on strengthening friendly relations with the people of the Republic of Korea.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 78TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, each April, Armenians worldwide commemorate the anniversary of the genocide that took the lives of an estimated 1.5 million Armenians from 1915 through 1923. The actual day of remembrance, April 24, commemorates the day in 1915 marking the beginning of the Ottoman campaign of religious, political, and cultural persecution against the Armenian people, when hundreds of Armenian community leaders were arrested and killed by Turkish forces to eliminate the Armenian people through deportation and death.

This day of remembrance has special significance in this particular historical moment. After decades of Soviet rule, Armenia is a newly free and independent country. Regrettably, however, many Armenians—both in Armenia and the enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh—are suffering because of the ongoing conflict in the region. That is why I supported the Freedom Support Act, which holds that the President may not provide assistance to Azerbaijan until he determines that Azer-

baijan has ended all blockades and other offensive action against Armenia and Karabakh, and respects internationally recognized human rights of Armenians and other minorities within its borders. As attempts are made to end the bitter ethnic fight with Azerbaijan, I believe it is important to commemorate what happened to the Armenian population at the beginning of this century.

I visited Armenia for the first time in January 1992. During that trip, I met with the country's new political leaders, with Armenian refugees from violence in Baku, and with survivors of the 1988 earthquake that leveled the city of Gumry. I was impressed by the commitment of the Armenian leadership to reform their country, and indeed, their eagerness to learn more about the United States political and economic model. I was truly saddened to learn that in Armenia, a country of nearly 3.3 million, 700,000 people are without permanent housing. I was horrified by the accounts of the brutality and violence that the refugees suffered. These incidents take on a deeper meaning in light of the genocide commemoration. It is a reminder that we cannot remain silent.

We cannot remain silent in the face of continued suffering of the Armenian people, or indeed when any group faces persecution and death at the hands of another simply for who they are. The breakup of the Eastern bloc and the Soviet Union has unleashed a host of ethnic conflicts that surge as we speak, any one of which, if the world is not vigilant, could result in yet another 20th-century genocide. In memory and honor of those Armenians killed, such a tragedy must not be allowed to happen again, to any group.

Mr. President, despite a long history of persecution, the Armenian people possess a moral strength, resilience, and a proud spirit. We join in this remembrance with American citizens of Armenian descent, whose ancestors became the victims of the first genocide of the 20th century. These crimes against humanity must never, and should never be forgotten.

#### NANCY MOORE THURMOND: IN MEMORIAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the Senate family has been profoundly saddened by the death of Nancy Moore Thurmond last week. Indeed, the entire State of South Carolina has been in an extended period of mourning since last Thursday. In part, this is a reflection of the enormous respect and regard the people of my State have for Senator THURMOND. But it is also a reflection of South Carolinians' realization that we have lost one of our most talented and promising daughters.

Mr. President, over the 22 years of her life, I had the privilege of watching

Nancy Moore Thurmond blossom into a truly remarkable young woman. She combined the beauty and grace of her mother with the determination and forcefulness of her father. And yet she was also unique. She was a remarkable human being in her own right, a woman of intellect and character who was a striking presence to all who knew and loved her.

Mr. President, I know firsthand the powerful love of STROM THURMOND for his eldest daughter. Her tragic death has been a tremendous blow to my senior colleague. We, too, have felt that blow. We, too, mourn for the young woman whom the Thurmond family has aptly called "our angel on Earth."

#### COMMEMORATING THE 78TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today, once again, we honor the courage and the memory of the 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children who perished during the early years of this century in the tragic ethnic massacres committed under the Ottoman Empire.

I also want to recognize the commitment and the importance of Armenian-American groups, such as the Armenian Assembly of America and the Armenian National Committee of America, in light of their continuing efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the bloodshed and turmoil in Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Between 1915 and 1923, officials in the Ottoman Empire implemented a policy under which innocent Armenian civilians were murdered or forced into exile. In April 1915, the members of the Armenian leadership in Istanbul and other Armenian centers were executed. Those already conscripted by the Ottoman Army, were disarmed, placed in work battalions, and killed.

Armenian civilians, deprived of their leadership, were deported from cities and villages across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia. Innocent women, children, and elderly Armenians were sent on death marches into the Syrian desert, during which many were raped and tortured.

This violent repression led to the death, through massacres, disease, and starvation, of a large part of the Armenian population. At the beginning of World War I, more than 2,500,000 Armenians were living in the Ottoman Empire. Today, fewer than 80,000 Armenians remain in that same geographical area.

The murderous persecution that the Armenians suffered for their faith, and the courage with which they bore their tragedy, is unmatched in human history. For this reason, I have strongly supported efforts to make April 24 a national day of remembrance for the Armenian victims.

Sadly, even today, Armenians still face violence and ethnic hatred. Fight-



ing between Armenians and Azerbaijanis for control of the Nagorno-Karabakh enclave has left thousands of people dead. Many more Armenians died this past winter due to lack of food, fuel, and medical supplies. A lasting solution to this tragic conflict can be reached only through peaceful negotiations.

Armenian-American groups, such as the Armenian Assembly of America and the Armenian National Committee of America, have played an essential role in promoting a peaceful resolution to this conflict and in educating all Americans to the issues facing the Armenian people. They have also worked tirelessly to keep alive the memory of those who perished earlier this century.

As the writer H.G. Wells observed, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." That is why this commemoration and the work of the Armenian groups is so important. Today, in honor of the courageous and proud Armenian people, we reaffirm our commitment to their cause and to the cause of peace.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 78TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, today we observe the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We honor the memory of 1½ million children, women, and men, and note with sadness that the world has yet to take heed of the lessons taught by that tragic event.

Throughout an 8-year period, from 1915 until 1923, Armenians were systematically murdered, tortured, forced out of their homes and left to die, under the Ottoman Empire. In a July 16 telegram to the Secretary of State in 1915, the United States Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau stated that "Deportation of and excesses against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from the harrowing reports of eyewitnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion."

Obvious similarities with modern-day tragedies from Saddam Hussein's programs against the Kurds to ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina show that we do well to mark this day. Surely, those who have been the victims of genocidal campaigns must mourn that we who are left to remember seem determined to forget and to turn away. We honor the memory of these Armenians by rededicating ourselves to remembrance.

The violence, however, is not over. Armenia and Azerbaijan continue to struggle for control of Nagorno-Karabakh. Thousands have died already in the conflict. In spite of humanitarian relief provided throughout

the year, hundreds more died in Armenia for lack of food, fuel, and medical attention. This crucial humanitarian relief must continue.

Many of the Armenian-American citizens living in this country today are descendants of those who were forced to leave their homeland to escape certain death. Here they have found freedom from persecution and have made immeasurable contributions to their adopted country. We join our Armenian friends and those who embrace the truth of these events so that they may never be forgotten.

I also would like to draw attention to the tireless efforts of such groups as the Armenian National Committee of America and the Armenian Assembly of America to ensure that the memory of the victims of Ottoman persecution endures. And I commend their efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement to the tragic fighting over Nagorno-Karabakh.

Until peoples and individuals feel secure in their right to freedom from ethnic and religious persecution, we will continue to commemorate anniversaries such as this, and recount their painful lessons. "Never again" is happening all around us. For the sake of the present and of future generations, we must never forget.

#### REMEMBERING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today we mark the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. I would like to reflect on several things related to that tragedy and to the changes that have occurred since our comparable commemoration last year.

First, it becomes increasingly evident with each passing year that the work of the Armenian Assembly and others who have strived to ensure remembrance of the genocide has paid off. Research, testimonies, and official statements all bear witness to the historical truth and appalling inhumanity of the genocide. Throughout the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of this century, it was the policy of the Ottoman empire to persecute brutally its Armenian minority. No serious historian can deny this.

During the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, 1894-96, 300,000 Armenians were massacred.

In 1909, 21,000 Armenians were murdered in Cilicia.

And between 1914 and 1923, an estimated 1,500,000 Armenians were killed and another 500,000 forced into exile.

In the words of Henry Morgenthau, America's Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at the time, "\*\*\* When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race: They understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they

made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

The genocide all but ended the 3,000-year-old presence of the Armenian population in the Turkish Near East. Survivors scattered across the Russian border, into the newly formed Arab States, into Europe and many to the United States. It is testimony both to the humanitarian nature of the American people, and to the devastating cruelty of Ottoman policies, that 132,000 Armenian orphans came to the United States during this period for adoption or foster care.

Much has been written about the Armenian genocide, the Jewish Holocaust and the massacres in Cambodia by the Khmer Rouge. Much has been written, but the reminders cannot come too often, nor can the cautions against forgetting ever be safely ignored. We live in a world where today's news becomes forgotten news almost immediately and where the lessons of history are studied carefully only rarely and even then by only a few.

This is a tragedy; it is also dangerous. It is said that those who forget their history are doomed to repeat it, and a glance today at the shelled ruins of Dubrovnik, the desperate faces of Srebrenica and the fear-filled eyes of Nagorno-Karabakh's children will tell us that the risk of repeating history is real, present, and awful. The welcome end of the cold war has given rise to an unwelcome resurgence in ethnic violence and rivalry that has already claimed thousands of lives and that has no clear end. Thus, celebrations of independence for the new States of Eastern Europe and the Balkans have been accompanied by funerals for their dead. And celebration of Armenia's independence must be accompanied by prayers for an end to the suffering brought about by violence, natural disaster, and economic blockade.

Thus, as we commemorate the millions who suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Empire three-quarters of a century ago, let us resolve never to allow in our time what was permitted to happen in their time. Let us resolve to strengthen support for international recognition of minority rights and all human rights. Let us strengthen support for international institutions that are empowered to intervene diplomatically to resolve international disputes. And let us work to establish an overriding international obligation to act—whenever that is essential—to prevent the systematic persecution of people on ethnic, cultural or racial grounds.

Elie Wiesel, chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Council, has said that Adolf Hitler had the Armenian example very much in mind when conceiving his own sick plan for exterminating the Jews. Hitler was confident that no one would care: "Who, after all, remembers the Armenians," he asked. Sadly, the answer to that question in Hitler's day

was silence. But the answer today is we do; we remember the Armenians.

We remember both those who survived and those who perished and we will not allow the truth of their suffering to be obscured by distortions of history or the passage of time. We remember the terrible costs of past indifference and we will not allow the lessons learned to be forgotten. We remember because it is right to honor the past, but because it is even more important to safeguard the future; and because we must never again do less than all we can to prevent the specter of genocide from raising its bloody hand on this planet.

#### IN COMMEMORATION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Saturday, April 24, is the 78th anniversary of the beginning of Armenian genocide, one of the worst tragedies in human history. Between 1915 and 1923, a systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide by the Ottoman Turkish Government resulted in the death of over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children.

On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up by the Turks. Armenian leaders in Istanbul and other Armenian centers were executed. The male population, already conscripted into the Ottoman Army, was disarmed, placed in work battalions, and gradually exterminated. The surviving Armenian women, children, and elderly were then forced on death marches into the Syrian desert, during which the unprotected women, children, and elderly were subjected to rape, torture, and mutilation. Thousands were seized and forced into Turkish and Kurdish homes and harems. The majority of the deportees died during the marches from starvation, exposure, disease, and massacres.

The Armenian genocide effectively eliminated the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire and marked the beginning of a century of cruelty and suffering, unparalleled in history. Indeed, it served as an inspiration for Adolf Hitler, who asked, before planning the extermination of European Jewry, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Today we understand all too well the price the world paid for not remembering the Armenian genocide. Yet the lessons of the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust seem to be lost as the world again sits idly by as ethnic cleansing—mass murder, torture, mass rape, and forced deportation—occurs in Bosnia. We owe it to the victims of the Armenian genocide not to forget their suffering, and to do what is in our power as individuals and as a nation to prevent the perpetration of crimes against humanity such as occurred 78

years ago.

#### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we take time today to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Every April we honor the memory of the 1½ million Armenians massacred between 1915 and 1923. Armenian-Americans, largely descended from those who escaped death and were forced to leave their historic homeland, have found security and opportunity here in the United States, and have made significant contributions to every aspect of American life. At this point in history, more than ever, it is absolutely crucial that all Americans remember the atrocities committed against the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman government.

Beginning on April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled and eventually murdered. Soon thereafter, 250,000 Armenians serving in the Ottoman Army during World War I were disarmed and placed in forced labor camps where they were either starved or executed. The Armenian people, deprived of their leadership and young able-bodied men, were then deported from every city, town, and village in the Ottoman Empire. During these death marches, the men and older boys were quickly separated from the others and executed. The women, children, and the elderly were marched for weeks into the desert, and the majority of the deportees died from forced starvation, disease, and massacres. As a result of the Armenian genocide, the Armenian population was effectively eliminated through a carefully executed government plan.

The Armenian genocide is one of the worst crimes against humanity that history has ever seen. Hitler himself, while planning his "final solution," asked, "Who remembered the Armenians?" citing the extermination of the Armenian people as a precedent for the Holocaust of the Jews. Yet very few Americans are aware of this atrocity. It is our duty to let them know what happened, and to make sure they never forget.

We commemorate this event to acknowledge what happened to prevent future genocides, not to point fingers or to breed ethnic conflict. Let us not ignore history. In remembering the suffering of the Armenians in those final years of the Ottoman Empire, we are telling the world that we know how important it is to remember history, and to not let it repeat itself.

#### COMMEMORATING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, today we commemorate the 78th anniversary

of the Armenian genocide. More than 1.5 million Armenians perished at the hands of the Turks in 1915. To this day, Turkey has refused to take responsibility for the atrocities committed against the Armenian people. We should not let our past perish in the smoke of destruction. This genocide, a precedent for the 20th century, reeks of inhumanity. The Ottoman government launched a campaign against the Armenians that was described by Henry Morgenthau as nothing less than "race extermination." In 1993, we are becoming too numb to the realities of race extermination, as it has become commonplace. As we stand face to face with scenes of atrocities around the world, we shake in horror. We must remember that human lives have value and that no group should be subjected to the atrocities that the Armenians and too many after them have faced, and unfortunately continue to face.

Today we commemorate a loss of conscience. This loss of conscience has cost too many people their lives. In only one century, genocide became the easiest of solutions. All too often, various nationalities, races, and religions become the subject of a question to be dealt with. And all too often, the solution was complete extermination. The lesson of the Armenian genocide was not learned. People did not remember. The lesson of the Jewish Holocaust was not learned. The Cambodian, Kurdish, and Bosnian genocides were soon to follow. Genocide as a government policy must end.

The 20th century has been tainted with hatred and prejudice. To answer the question that Hitler once posed, "who remembers the Armenians?" We must always answer "we do and we will never let it happen again."

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for morning business has expired.

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 1335 which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time until 10:45 a.m. is for debate only on the cloture motion with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from



Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] or their designees.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have listened with interest, as I always do, to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM]. He says that the fundamental question is, "Should we raise the deficit?" He says the Democrats say, "yes." And the Republicans say, "no."

He also said that we have \$300 billion in deficit spending now already. If that will not bring prosperity, how will an additional \$15 or \$16 billion bring prosperity? What the distinguished Senator from Texas does not say is that \$300 billion deficit that is estimated is not for the creation of infrastructure in this country, it is not for the building of highways, bridges, improved waterways, sewage and water disposal, water treatment facilities, education, and civilian research. The distinguished Senator from Texas apparently conveniently overlooks the fact that \$200 billion of that \$300 billion in deficit this year will be for interest on the national debt.

If that \$200 billion were eliminated, that in itself would decrease the anticipated deficit by almost two-thirds. How did we get the \$200 billion in interest on the national debt? Well, that story has been told on this floor many times.

It was through the misguided economic policies that were followed during the Reagan administration, big tax cuts for the wealthy, massive buildup in defense, which is Government spending. And then came the recession, and the savings and loan bailout. All of these things together created triple-digit billion dollar deficits during the Reagan and Bush eras, the first time in the history of the Republic. And as a result of those triple-digit billion dollar deficits, the national debt was quadrupled. And as a result, the interest on the national debt went from \$69 billion a year in the last year of the Carter administration, to what it is now, \$200 billion a year. So \$200 billion of that \$300 billion deficit, to which the distinguished Senator from Texas alluded, goes for interest on the national debt. That is a hidden tax on every American—every man, woman, boy, and girl.

Moreover, let it not be thought that we should equate the \$300 billion deficit with the \$16 billion in this bill, which has been reduced now to \$12 billion—reduced by 25 percent—in conformity with the President's recommendations.

What we see here, when stripped of all of its fancy trappings, Mr. President, is not so much a fundamental question, to quote the distinguished Senator from Texas; what we see here is a fundamental change, a fundamen-

tal change by Republican Senators, who now say it is time to tear up the national credit card.

Well, it sure is, after they ran it into the ground, ran it into a "red sea" for 12 years. We went on a national credit card binge during the years of the Reagan administration, and now it is coming home to roost.

Now we see a fundamental change in the position of the other side. They want to tear up the national credit card. As it has been explained over and over again, this small bill, the cost of this small bill has been included many times over. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] has stated it has been included 30 times over, or more, in the budget resolution that was adopted by the Senate not many weeks ago, and against which every Republican voted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield myself, on behalf of Senator HATFIELD, 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee says that we do have \$300 billion of deficits this year, but those are bad deficits; those are the wrong kind of deficits. But if we had \$12 billion of good deficits, then our problems would go away; we would create hundreds of thousands of jobs, and we would spend hundreds of millions of dollars.

If the \$300 billion deficits are not being used for infrastructure, waterways, highways, education, and research, if we are not spending money on the things we should be spending money on, whose fault is it? Did we not appropriate these funds? Did we not set priorities? We just wrote a budget 3 weeks ago, spending a record \$1.5 trillion. If we did not put enough money into that budget for infrastructure, highways, waterways, education and research, whose fault is it? It seems to me that it is our fault.

I do not know the difference between a good deficit and a bad deficit. All I know is whether they are good deficits or bad deficits, whether they are Republican deficits or Democratic deficits, we are borrowing money and taking money away from the private sector, money that could go to build new plants, new farms, new factories, and generate new jobs.

The issue here is a simple issue: Can we create jobs in America by going out and borrowing more money and having the Government spend it? Is spending too low? Is Government borrowing too low? Can we raise spending, add to the

deficit, increase Government borrowing and somehow create prosperity? That is the fundamental question. Republicans say "no." That does not mean we are not willing to work with the distinguished chairman, or that we are not willing to work with the President.

Our position is this, and on these two issues we have taken a very firm stand: One, no net new spending, period; two, no further increase in the deficit. Those are our two positions.

If there are programs in this spending bill that are truly emergencies, that truly are of higher priority than what we are currently spending money on, then let us sit down together, identify lower priority programs, cut them, and fund these higher priority programs. We have made it clear from the very beginning what the issues here are: no net new spending and no further increase in the deficit. But if the President is willing to cut existing programs to reorder priorities to fund higher priority programs the way families and businesses have to fund higher priority programs by cutting lower priority expenditures, then we can have an agreement.

If there is gridlock, it is not gridlock about a willingness to change priorities or break the status quo; it is a gridlock on the part of the President by trying to maintain the status quo, trying to tax and spend our way to prosperity.

Finally, Mr. President, one of the things that makes this so difficult for the people who feel as I do is that the President has said for 3 months that: We have to raise taxes on income, on energy, and on Social Security, to lower the deficit to help the economy. As it turned out, we adopted a budget. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee said every Republican voted against it. I am proud that I voted against it because it was the largest tax increase in American history, and those taxes went primarily to new spending.

If everything the President says will happen happens, the deficit never goes below \$200 billion, is rising in the fifth year and, 10 years from now, will exceed \$400 billion. That is not a movement in the right direction.

So my point is this, and it is a very simple point: If 3 weeks ago we were going to pass a budget to help the economy by raising taxes on income, energy and Social Security so as to lower the deficit, why today are we going to help the economy by raising the deficit to increase spending to create jobs? Either we were wrong 3 weeks ago, or we are wrong today.

Well, the reality is, the rhetoric 3 weeks ago was to raise taxes to lower the deficit and help the economy. But the reality 3 weeks ago was raise taxes to fund spending. That is the same message we are hearing today.

The American people, I believe, have broken the code on the President's eco-

conomic program. Basically, the code is that the President wants to raise taxes to make the Government bigger, not to make job creation in the private sector of the economy bigger or more vigorous or more powerful.

So our position is a simple position: No net new spending; no more deficit spending. On those issues there is not going to be a compromise. If the President wants to pay for these programs by cutting other spending, then we might have a compromise. But if the President is not willing to do what every family and every business in America has to do every year—and that is pay our bills—then there is not going to be a compromise on this issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, 10 percent of this Nation is on food stamps—26 million people. That is not a Democratic problem. That is not a Republican problem. That is a national problem. That is a human problem. It is a real human problem.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Unemployment is stuck at 7 percent. If the Senator does not realize that we have an economic emergency right now, right here in this country, then I urge him to talk to some of those real people who are on the unemployment rolls, who do not know how they are going to feed their children after this week or the next. Ask them if they think we have an economic emergency. Ask them if they think we need a jobs bill.

The distinguished Senator says, well, if we have not been investing enough, whose fault is it?

I was at the budget summit. So was the Senator. Who made the fight at that summit? Who led the fight at that summit for investing in infrastructure in this country, for investing in bridges, highways, waterways, water and sewage disposal facilities, and education? Who led it? The Senator was there. I was there. Who led the fight? Not the administration, not the Bush administration. The Bush administration wanted to further cut, cut, cut discretionary domestic spending. Increasing military spending has been fine with people at the other end of the avenue for the past 12 years.

I will tell you one thing. The cry went out in the 1990 budget summit: "We need to invest in this country," and that cry was led by this Senator, supported strongly by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], and by the then Senator from Georgia, Mr. Fowler, and by the then Representative, Leon Panetta. We made the fight. We made some progress, but not enough, because the Bush administration opposed public investment in infrastructure.

Madam President, I do not want to take all the time on my side.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I wonder if the distinguished floor man-

ager will yield me time. I wish to comment, if I may.

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor and will let the Senator use his own time.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes from our time.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will allow me, I yield the remainder of the time to Mr. SASSER and he can yield time to others. Mr. DORGAN and Mr. WELLSTONE wish some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, before the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee leaves, I have a question that I would like to address to him. I do not know whether this is accurate, and I would appreciate it if he would straighten me out. I read that the President has added \$200 million in new spending to enable cities to rehire, it says, 10,000 laid-off police officers; is that correct? Is that in this legislation?

Mr. BYRD. It is \$200 million; that is correct. That is to put police officers out on the street, where they ought to be.

Mr. CHAFEE. I just wonder if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee gets the full import, or has thought of it, because I had an opportunity, and I am sure in his busy schedule that we have in the Federal Government, perhaps he has not. The proposal is that the Federal Government pay for city and town police officers. That is the proposal.

Mr. BYRD. No. The proposal is for CDBG moneys to be used by the localities—

Mr. CHAFEE. Right.

Mr. BYRD. Which they can do now up to 15 percent of their total money. They can do that now to employ people—and I am answering on my time—to employ people in public service jobs.

Why should they not be allowed to employ policemen and get them out from behind the desk?

I hope the Senator is not going to pick on this little item. Let him go out and ask the people of Washington, DC, here. Let him go up to Rhode Island and ask those people if they think we need more policemen on the streets.

This President is trying to do something. He has very little to do it with. And that side of the aisle is not even going to let him do this and allow \$200 million.

Mr. CHAFEE. Is this my time, Madam President? I am confused.

Mr. BYRD. No; this is my time. Now, the remainder of it is the Senator's time.

Mr. CHAFEE. All right. I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. BYRD. I answered the Senator's question, and I did so graciously on my own time.

Mr. CHAFEE. The Senator was very kind, as always, about that.

Now, Madam President, for those who are listening here, you would

think to hear the discussion on this floor that there was absolutely nothing done about the infrastructure—that is a big, new word we are using a lot around here—that the Bush administration did nothing about the infrastructure.

Well, as Al Smith used to say, "Let us take a look at the record." For this current fiscal year, there is appropriated for highway building in the United States of America—is it \$1 billion or \$2 billion or \$3 billion—no; \$18 billion, the largest appropriations for highway construction in the history of the Nation for a single year.

All right. What about mass transit? Is that being completely neglected? That is \$3.8 billion.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. No. I am in full flight now, and I will return a little later.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield for a question on my time?

Mr. CHAFEE. No. I watched the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee on this floor for the last 3 days, solidly.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAFEE. I wish to speak now for a total of 5 minutes, if I can get it.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. He is in full flight.

Mr. CHAFEE. Now, Madam President, if I might, before I was so rudely interrupted, I would point out what is the authorization. What did those skinflint Republicans authorize—

Mr. BYRD. They authorized—

Mr. CHAFEE. For 6 years?

Mr. BYRD. They authorized a highway bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. They authorized \$155 billion.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAFEE. Now, were we weeping around here? I have my handkerchief—

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. CHAFEE. Because we are crying that there is nothing done about the infrastructure. My goodness sake. I am sobbing. Excuse me. I will recover.

We have a terrible situation. The infrastructure of the country is crumbling.

Mr. BYRD. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAFEE. Nobody is doing anything.

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. CHAFEE. I am overcome with emotion.

Mr. BYRD. Let me help the Senator.

Mr. CHAFEE. It is \$200 million.

Mr. BYRD. Let me help the Senator.

Mr. CHAFEE. It is nothing. You are skinflints. You are withholding everything from the infrastructure.

Mr. BYRD. Exactly.

Mr. CHAFEE. "Infrastructure" is going to be in the new spelling bee they are having in Washington. How do you spell "infrastructure"? What does it mean? It is now a big new word.



Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the Senator, now that he has gotten himself under control, now yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. It is very difficult.

Madam President, I hate to appeal—I am reluctant to appeal—for order, but I would like to proceed. And then, I am so overcome that I may have to go back and recover in my office. But I think I will carry on for just 1 more minute with my tears.

Mr. BYRD. I say to the Senator, we put in—

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, this is the situation. The basic difference in approach here between the two parties is that the Republican Party is fully conscious that the Federal Government now, for every dollar it spends, 20 cents is borrowed, 20 cents is being levied upon our children and our grandchildren to pay back. That is a horrible situation. And the Republicans are saying enough is enough.

Are we going to end every bit of deficit spending? No. But the time to start is now. As the old Chinese proverb says: The way to start a long journey is to take the first step. And we hear the Democrats say, well, \$16 billion is change—

Two additional minutes, please, Madam President.

Sixteen billion dollars, we should not even pay any attention to that. And the Republicans are saying it is not necessary at this time.

The thing is labeled an emergency stimulus package. It is neither an emergency, nor is it a stimulus. Furthermore, if we wanted, there are a whole series of lovely programs that the distinguished chairman has outlined. But the thing is, he is not willing to pay for it. And if you are not willing to pay for it, then what value are they? Do you really want them that much?

Madam President, think of it. This week, all of us noticed a lot of youngsters in the Capitol and in the city of Washington. I assume most of them are here on spring vacation. And it is these young people who are going to pick up the tab for the profligacy of us, our generation—me, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and others.

Twenty cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends is borrowed, and I think that is wrong. Can we correct it overnight? No. But we certainly are deserving of a try to end it. And that is what this debate is all about here today.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I am so glad that we did not have to call the doctor. The Senator is fully recovered, and he appears to be in the very best of robust health.

Madam President, what we hear on the other side of the aisle is, for 12 years now, for 12 years we have been

using the national credit card; we have been doing deficit spending. Now stop us before we kill again. Stop us before we kill again.

How can they on that side say with a straight face anything about deficit spending when they have been presiding for a dozen years over the largest deficits in the history of this country?

Mr. CHAFEE. I wonder if the chairman would yield for a question from me?

Mr. BYRD. Oh, I will do so graciously.

Mr. CHAFEE. Now, this is it, Madam President. The President of the United States, over the past 12 years, be it Mr. Reagan—

Mr. BYRD. Now this time is on the Senator's time.

Mr. CHAFEE. On my time. I still have part of my 2 minutes.

President Reagan or President Bush have sent budgets up here which have involved all kinds of cuts, including, for instance, in the TVA, where we have a very strong proponent. And what was the code word that was used as soon as that budget was delivered here? How well everybody on that side knows. "The budget is dead on arrival. DOA."

And those were very clever words that they used, meaning that we are not paying any attention to that budget. We are paying no attention to the cuts. It is dead on arrival. We are going to go forward with our spending as we want it.

Think of it—the majority party. We have not had control of the House of Representatives since when? 1938; 1943, maybe.

Mr. BYRD. You have been in the White House most of the time for the last 25 years.

Mr. CHAFEE. In the Senate, we have had 6 glorious years thank goodness for the country.

Mr. BYRD. Glorious years? Triple-digit billion-dollar deficits in those glorious years.

Mr. CHAFEE. In effect, Madam President, this President has submitted, with his most optimistic projections, what is going to happen in 4 years. There will be \$1 trillion added to the debt of the Nation. That is under his figures, not my figures; your figures, the President's figures, \$1 trillion.

That is what they objected to about the Reagan-Bush years; that every 4 years there was \$1 trillion added. In effect, Madam President, they are emulating, indeed, probably going to exceed it, because they have very optimistic predictions in their budgets.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, may I say to the Senator, he has spoken about the budgets that were pronounced DOA. What about the votes on those budgets? The House leadership put Republican Members to the test on the Republican President's budgets, on

Mr. Reagan's budgets, on Mr. Bush's budgets, and Republican Members voted against those budgets. Sure, they were dead on arrival. They did not even have the support of the Republican minority in the House.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SASSER. I ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, under the rules, any Senator, when a budget comes to the floor, may call up the President's budget if he or she seeks to do so. Did any Republican Member call up President Bush's budget on the floor to your recollection? I have no recollection of that.

Mr. BYRD. Well, when the Republicans were in control here, they did not even call up their own President's budget. When they were in control in the Senate, they did not even call up their own President's budget for a vote.

Mr. SASSER. Does the distinguished chairman recall that the last Bush budget that was presented to this body had a deficit reduction over 5 years of only \$2 billion, whereas the Clinton proposal that passed this body, with not one single Republican vote in favor of it, reduced the deficit by almost \$500 billion over 5 years.

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely.

Mr. CHAFEE. I wonder if the distinguished chairman would yield for just a question?

Mr. BYRD. Of course, on the Senator's time.

Mr. CHAFEE. You know, Madam President, I just think we ought to invoke truth in labeling around here. The chairman of the—

Mr. BYRD. We ought to have done that a dozen years ago.

Mr. CHAFEE. The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee uses language that has become popular also and that is he has reduced the deficit by \$500 billion, I think he said.

Now, everybody who is listening to this better understand what he is talking about. He is taking a line that might have been here and saying it is going to be here.

Mr. SASSER. Parliamentary inquiry. Is this a question on the chairman's time or is this a statement on the time of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. CHAFEE. My question is the following.

Mr. SASSER. Parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is being charged to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. The question is as follows: Is it not so, despite the legerdemain and the descriptions, that at the end of 4 years under the Clinton proposal the debt of the Nation will increase by \$1 trillion under the President's figures?

Mr. SASSER. Were it not—

Mr. CHAFEE. Please answer my question.

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator will allow me the common courtesy of an answer, I will be pleased to do that.

Now were it not for the Clinton proposal, the budget deficit would have increased by an additional \$496 billion, because the Clinton administration was elected at the end of a 12-year period of the most irresponsible fiscal policy in the history of the United States of America, put in place by Presidents of the party of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. I was looking for an answer. I have given up.

Mr. SASSER. That is the condition the President finds himself in.

Mr. CHAFEE. May I have an answer? May I have the courtesy of an answer?

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator from Rhode Island is so concerned about reducing the budget deficit, why did the Senator not join forces with those of us on this side of the aisle to reduce that deficit by \$496 billion over the next 5 years? Why did the Senator oppose reducing the deficit by almost \$500 billion over 5 years? Can the Senator give us a rational explanation for that?

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Of course, I did not get an answer to the question because the answer to the question is—

Mr. SASSER. Could I get an answer to my question, Madam President?

Mr. CHAFEE. Under the chairman's own proposal, the debt of the Nation is going to increase \$1 trillion. That is the answer.

So with all the pillorying they have had of the prior administrations, what that wicked Reagan administration did, what that Bush administration did, \$1 trillion in 4 years. And that is using their figures, Madam President.

Now they say they have presented a budget that is going to do wonderful things. Does anybody believe that? They could not even vote against cutting honey price supports. They will not even vote against price supports for honey.

And take a look at the record of the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee. Where is he on these votes? Why is he not even willing to cut \$16 billion, \$16 billion?

So, we are in a very, very sad situation. They have the votes to do lots of things. Thank goodness they do not have the votes to put through this so-called phony stimulus package.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, the hypocrisy that we have seen on this floor this morning is absolutely breathtaking. I thought I had seen it all here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, but this morning I think a new precedent was established.

I asked my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, who has now left the

floor, I see, why would he not vote with those of us on this side of the aisle to try to impose some fiscal responsibility just a few weeks ago and reduce this deficit by an additional \$500 billion, \$496 billion to be exact? He would not even answer that question.

Where was my friend from Rhode Island when the Presidents from his party over the last 12 years were quadrupling the national debt, quadrupling it? When Ronald Reagan came to office in 1981, the national indebtedness of the American people stood at slightly over \$900 billion. And it took us 200 years to build up that indebtedness. And when Ronald Reagan and his disciple George Bush left office, the national debt stood in excess of \$4 trillion.

And when economic historians write the history of the decade of the 1980's, they will say there has never been, in a modern, industrialized, democratic society, such reckless and irresponsible fiscal policy in all of the 20th century in any country, save a banana republic.

And here, the Senator from Rhode Island has the gall, the unmitigated gall, to come on the floor of this body and attempt to defeat a jobs bill which is part of an overall effort to pull this economy out of the ditch that his Presidents put it into.

Madam President, for all—

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I have the floor and I am going to keep it.

Mr. CHAFEE. Are we going to get some time to respond here, or are we going to have to listen to this? Are we going to give some answers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, for almost a month, Republicans on the other side of the aisle have held this President's job program hostage—have held it hostage. This jobs bill is part of an overall economic proposal—part of an overall economic proposal that the President took to the American people as a candidate. He was elected on the basis, first and foremost, of getting this economy moving and creating jobs.

The first thing he did was to propose a budget that for the first time, really, in 12 years, dealt with the deficit. To the man—to the man and woman—those on the other side of the aisle voted against that effort to invoke some kind of fiscal responsibility on the Government of this country. They could not defeat it because they did not have the votes. A budget resolution comes to the floor under special protected procedures so they could not filibuster it. A spiteful, willful minority could not defeat that budget resolution because they had to have a majority of votes under the rules of the Senate.

But now we come with a small proposal to try to create jobs for the

American people. It does not have that protection against a filibuster. So a willful, spiteful minority, day after day after day, vote after vote after vote, has denied the will of the majority in this body. They have denied the will of the majority of the American people. The polls that I see indicate that the American people want this jobs bill by almost a 2-to-1 majority.

In early April we learned that 22,000 more of our fellow citizens had lost their jobs. In my own native State of Tennessee there are 50,000 people walking the streets today looking for work who had work before this recession started. In early April we learned that almost 60,000 more construction workers had lost their jobs; unemployment up to 16 percent in the construction industry. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee comes to the floor of this body and says we need to take funds out of the highway bill and get an infrastructure program going and get construction workers to work. The Senator from Rhode Island comes to the floor with the disingenuous argument, "We already authorized the money."

Yes, my friends, but you would not appropriate it. The money has been authorized but it is sitting in a bank account, not appropriated. And construction workers are out of work all across this country.

Then we learn that retail sales plummeted in March, down 1 full percentage point, the largest decline in 2 years. Still, a willful minority would not budge. The jobs program remains mired in gridlock.

We learned that consumer confidence fell. Why? Why? Because people are concerned about jobs. But even this, even more jobs being lost, even construction jobs unemployment standing at 16 percent, consumer confidence going down, retail sales going down—even this did not convince a willful minority to release this President's jobs program, which is part of his overall economic recovery program.

Many have wondered, what are they doing? Are they just trying to embarrass the President? Some have been talked to individually on the recess by mayors of their cities, by county executives, telling them, "We need this jobs bill. Our people are hurting. Will you not relent and let it pass? Let the majority rule."

Some on that side responded, "Well, I would but I do not want to be the first to go. If others will go with me and vote to break this filibuster in our caucus, then so will I. But I cannot be the first to do it."

I say to some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, do we not have a greater responsibility than just partisanship? Do we not have a greater responsibility than just to our political party? Is our responsibility in the final analysis not to the people of this coun-



try? That is why we are here. They are the ones who elect us. They are the ones who are paying our salary.

So I would say to some of our more reasonable friends on the other side of the aisle, do what you think you ought to do. Vote to help the mayors and the county executives in your States who are telling you that they need this help. Vote to help the construction workers, who are telling you that they need this help. Vote to help those who are out of work and are telling you that they need this help.

Madam President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 6 minutes and 2 seconds.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, the Senator from North Dakota has been on the floor and was seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee. I was going to come and offer some quiet, thoughtful, reflective points. I am not sure this is the time in the Senate debate to try to do that.

My dad and I used to own a number of horses that we raced, one of whom required blinders. He was too distracted by reality if we did not put blinders on the horse. And I was thinking of those blinders in the last several weeks during this debate on the jobs bill.

There is almost a disconnection between some of the discussion in this Chamber and the reality outside of this Chamber. What is the reality? The reality is we have a \$4 trillion debt and a \$300 billion deficit—yes. And that is a serious problem.

And there is more reality. Part of the reality is 10 million people today are looking for work and cannot find it; 25 million people are on food stamps; 35 million people have no health insurance; 2.7 million reported cases of child abuse last year; 4 million kids who were born in this country this year, 1 million without a father; 800,000 of those 1 million kids will never in their lifetime learn the identity of their father. Washington, DC, is the murder capital of the world. That is also part of the reality outside of this Chamber and out in the streets of America.

So, what has President Clinton proposed? A plan that says let us do two things: First, let us cut the budget deficit with the first honest budget presented here in a dozen years. Yes, the first honest budget in a dozen years. Let us cut the deficit in a real way and in a tough way, cutting spending and raising taxes. And we had to find all the votes for that; there was not one vote for it on the other side of the aisle.

And second, President Clinton says, let us construct a jobs program.

Now some on the other side jump up and say, "Wait a second, the last quarter GNP shows economic growth, over 4 percent. This demonstrates that we do not need to do anything." Well, a half a percent of that "growth" was fixing the damage from the hurricane in Florida. If we have more bad news, I suppose we will have more reported economic growth from the other side.

The problem is economic growth is not creating jobs. Economic recovery without jobs is like going to a meal without food. It is meaningless to us. It is meaningless to those in this country who this morning are out of work.

A newspaper reporter once interviewed an 80-year-old man and said, "You must have seen a lot of changes in your life."

The old codger said, "Yep, and I guess I used up every one of them."

I hear that mentality in people who say, let us do nothing, let us be happy, let us let things continue as they have continued.

We know what has happened for the last 12 years is the wrong course. Do we know the Clinton approach is the right course? No; we do not know that for sure, but it is fundamental economic policy change; it moves us in a different direction. It is the first honest budget in a long, long time. He is the first President who says let us deal with real problems in a real way.

I know some of this has become symbolism in this debate, but I hope one of these days real soon we will get the best of what both sides have to offer and move forward. Let's recognize the reality in this country today: People are out of work; people are in trouble; the country is not growing the way we want it to grow. Instead, we want opportunity, hope, and growth for the American people.

So I want to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for giving me the opportunity to speak. I know we are going to have a vote today on cloture. My hope is that we are successful on that vote so we can move ahead. In 1981, I remember exactly what the folks on the other side of the aisle said in the House. They said, "We have a new President. He deserves to have his plan enacted," and it was.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Now we have a new President. This President deserves to have his economic change plan enacted. That side has stood in the way now for a couple of months.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I want to just amend the Senator's comments in one respect. Whether the President deserves to have his program enacted or not depends on whether he can get a majority of the Members of

this Senate to vote for the program. But the President, in my judgment, is entitled to be able to get to a vote on his program. What this cloture vote is all about is whether a minority of this body is going to continue to frustrate and deny the opportunity to vote on the substance of the President's proposal.

We are not asking the Republicans to vote for the President's proposal, although I think they should because I think it is a good proposal. I think we need this jobs bill. I think the economy is hurting, and I think the American people know that the economy is hurting.

All we are seeking to day is simply the opportunity to get to a vote on the President's program. Members may then vote for it or vote against it. The responsibility then falls upon the majority to try to carry the President's program. But as my colleague said, for a willful minority simply to deny the Senate the opportunity to vote on the President's program is, in effect, cutting the President off at the knees as he tries to get the American economy moving again and respond to the problems that our people are facing all across the country.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the Senator's comments. The point I was making is the President is entitled to have this scaled-down jobs bill move forward. The votes exist to pass the revised jobs bill on the floor of the Senate. Our problem is we cannot get to a vote. That is the point I wanted to make. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. I would like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I listened carefully to the discussion by the Senator from Tennessee. I must say he is bringing a new technique of debating on the floor here. Somehow one's rationale and persuasiveness is increased in direct proportion to volume: The louder you yell, apparently, the more persuasive one is.

He has talked as though he has not been in the Senate. He came to the Senate the year I did. He sat securely in the majority for the past 6 years. All those years he was voting cheerfully for different programs. Suddenly, this deficit, the debt of the Nation is all the Republicans, and it is as though he has never been around, nor has his party been in charge of the House of Representatives. I do not know where this tremendous power that the Republicans seem to have had came from. Certainly we were not aware of it.

Now we have heard the Senator from Maryland deplore the fact that a majority is not permitted to carry forward with this program. Well, the shoe is on the other foot now. How well we

remember the filibuster that was conducted against the capital gains. I just wonder how the Senator from Maryland voted on that. I know darn well know how he voted. He voted against cloture. And now that was a little different, perhaps. I do not know how it was different.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. It was a filibuster against the capital gains, cheerfully participated in by all the Democrats, and now they do not like it—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. When there is a cloture on this side.

Madam President, also I have watched the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee the other night talk about the rules; that is what the rules are. He filled out the tree, as it were. That was perfectly permissible, but somehow if the Republicans use the rules, there is something sinister about it, there is something devious, there is something un-American about it. Well, I do not think they really think that. I really do not think they think the stimulus package is much either.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. Sure.

Mr. SARBANES. The closest analogy that I can think of to the present situation, if the Senator chooses to draw analogies, was in the first term of the Reagan administration. President Reagan sent to the Congress a supplemental appropriations bill. It was not paid for. Actually, it was not even paid for in the broader context. This bill is paid for in the budget resolution many times over. The net is a spending cut of over \$200 billion, taking this bill into account with the budget resolution.

When President Reagan sent a proposal here, we allowed a vote on his proposal. We allowed his supplemental to be voted on up or down. Unlike my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we did not seek to block the consideration of that proposal. We were in a minority, but we had enough numbers to block its consideration and we refrained from doing so. We gave the President a vote on his bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield whatever time is necessary to the Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, we are going to have a cloture vote in about 7 or 8 minutes, and I do not think cloture is going to be invoked. I do not think that is the end of the world. Again, we have gone back over the past 8, 10 years and put all this in the RECORD about how many cloture motions have been filed when Republicans had the leadership or the majority, and when the Democrats have had the ma-

jority. It is pretty much of a wash. We can make that argument all day long.

We are using the rules. We do have a right to be heard, and we do believe this is a big mistake. That is the only thing wrong with this package: It is a big mistake.

As far as gridlock, I think my colleagues on the other side have the world's record. They tied up the capital gains rate reduction for 4 years. We made the case that it was costing jobs in the private sector. But then we get this package out and they say that it creates a lot of jobs in the public sector, and we think, oh, we have to pass this right away. I remember the 1983 jobs bill we passed in the Reagan administration which was roundly criticized by the GAO saying we only created 35,000 jobs, and President Clinton is claiming this is going to create 219,000 jobs, a half-million jobs—every day it is a different figure.

The bottom line is this is just a terrible package. If you go back to your hometown, go back to your home State, they say: Cut spending first, cut spending first. If you cannot cut it, pay for it. At least you have to pay for it. And that has been the difference, the fundamental difference, in the debate on this floor. We can argue the rest of the week or the rest of the year and there is going to be that fundamental difference.

If there is an interest on that side of the aisle, or an interest in the White House, to pay for some of the things they want, then we are prepared to do business. We had a package yesterday. We had a billion dollars for highways, money for summer jobs, money for immunization, money for northwest projects, and also many for the Small Business Administration. We paid for it. It was defeated, but I must say we got four or five Democrats to vote with us. So I think the defections are coming from that side of the aisle. They are hearing from people in their States who say: Cut spending first. That is all the American people want, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Independents.

I think there are a lot of people scared in this country. Every day you hear from the White House that they have some new idea about spending money or some new tax. I met with a group of business people this morning who are scared to death. They are not going to hire anybody or expand their business. There is going to be another economic downturn unless we have a little stability in this administration and they take time out to focus on one or two things they want to do instead of trying to do everything and enact a whole lot of new taxes. There is already \$273 billion in net new taxes in the package; \$3.23 in new taxes for every dollar in spending cuts. Then on April 15 they advocate another whole new tax called a value-added tax which is regressive, which hits the poor.

It seems to me we have to have a time out. It has only been 91 days, or 90 days, and the American people are saying: Let us cut spending; let us stop talking about new spending; let us stop talking about new taxes; let us get the economy to grow; and let us create jobs in the private sector. That is the jobs bill the American people want.

So I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us today in indicating their strong support, that if we are going to do anything on this floor that we pay for it. Then we might be able to work out some package that will satisfy the great majority of the American people, if not a majority of our colleagues. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, what is the timeframe?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon controls 4 minutes. The Senator from West Virginia controls 13 seconds.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would be happy to share some of my time with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, my friend is so gracious. I would only recall, if the Senator will allow me, Miltiades led the Athenians to victory at the Battle of Marathon, in which there were 10 Athenian generals. Themistocles and Aristides the Just were among those 10 generals. That was in 490 BC. At the battle of Salamis, in 480 BC, Themistocles led the Athenians to a victory over the fleet of Xerxes. Plutarch tells us that Themistocles, on one occasion, said that he looked upon it as the principal excellence of a general to know and foresee the designs of the enemy. Aristides responded by saying, "That is indeed a necessary qualification, but there is also another excellent one, and highly becoming a general, and that is to have clean hands."

I would simply say that when our friends on the other side of the aisle say, "Well, let us pay for it; let us tear up the national credit card; let us not build up the deficit," Madam President, our friends do not come into this court with clean hands. For 12 years they used the national credit card. This President is trying to shift the burden to ourselves. He is having to raise taxes to avoid continuing the shift of that burden to our children.

Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator and I am ready for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 15 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator want some additional time? I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I will not take that amount. I thank the Chair and I thank my colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Madam President, I just want to make a closing comment, and that is



we have been in a long debate. There has been pretty heavy rhetoric at times on both sides. I happen to be one of those who believes there is a distinction between a battle and a war, and so the battles have been fought and they have been determined by outcome of votes, various kinds of votes on amendments, and so forth.

Madam President, this issue is not totally settled to the satisfaction of anyone, but at the same time I think there is an honorable peace that can be brought to the factions that have been represented in this Chamber. I think the cloture vote is not an end in and of itself. There is a group, I am sure, on both sides of the aisle that would like to find some common ground, some meeting place. I shall not give up that effort, and I do not think this vote will finalize that effort on either side.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on Committee Substitute to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill:

Harlan Mathews, Dianne Feinstein, Barbara Boxer, Jeff Bingaman, Bob Kerrey, Barbara A. Mikulski, Robert C. Byrd, Patrick J. Leahy, Frank R. Lautenberg, Wendell Ford, David Pryor, Carol Moseley-Braun, Tom Daschle, John D. Rockefeller, Jim Sasser, Bill Bradley, Patty Murray.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

#### VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee substitute, as amended, to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent due to a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Leg.]

#### YEAS—56

Akaka	Feinstein	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Mitchell
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Heflin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Pell
Bryan	Johnston	Pryor
Bumpers	Kennedy	Reid
Byrd	Kerrey	Riegle
Campbell	Kerry	Robb
Conrad	Kohl	Rockefeller
Daschle	Krueger	Sarbanes
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Sasser
Dodd	Leahy	Simon
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Exon	Lieberman	Wofford
Feingold	Mathews	

#### NAYS—43

Bennett	Faircloth	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Gregg	Pressler
Coats	Hatch	Roth
Cochran	Hatfield	Shelby
Cohen	Helms	Smith
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Danforth	Lott	Wallop
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Durenberger	McCain	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Simpson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 43.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, during which Senators be permitted to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I will have an announcement shortly with respect to the consideration of the pending measure and subsequent actions to be taken by the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

#### THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for giving us time for morning business, because we did not have a whole lot of time at the 9:30 period.

I want to speak about something that is very current in our minds here in the Senate, because we confirm Presidential nominees for the Supreme Court. Obviously, it is more important to the President right now because the President of the United States is considering the various people for the vacancy on the Supreme Court. So even though the White House is primarily

concerned about the legislation that we just had the cloture vote on and even though this body is most concerned about that, it will not be long until we are going to have to start giving our attention to whomever the President announces as his nominee to the Supreme Court.

I would like to express to my colleagues some opinions I have on the President's approach, not necessarily on whom he ought to nominate because that is not my responsibility. But there is this upcoming vacancy on the Supreme Court. I think that we ought to give it attention periodically because it is going to be really in our minds later on here during the summer.

The Constitution, of course, gives the President the authority to nominate Members of the Supreme Court. The nomination power is enumerated in article II of the Constitution. That is the President's portion of the Constitution. Accompanying the Presidential responsibility to nominate, as set forth there in article II, is the Senate's obligation to advise and consent.

Over the last three decades the President's role has not changed any, but the Senate's role has very dramatically changed. Not because the Constitution has been amended—nothing has been changed in the Constitution—but there is an evolution of a process here always in the Congress, and on everything. And there has been an evolution of this process of advise and consent on Senate nominations.

Just in comparison, Byron White, who has now resigned from the Supreme Court—and it is his vacancy that the President will be filling—when he came before the Senate Judiciary Committee for his confirmation hearings in 1962, he was asked eight questions by committee members. Mr. President, let me emphasize he was asked just eight questions. His successor, of course, whoever that person is that President Clinton nominates, can look forward to at least 3, and maybe possibly 5 days of questions from the Judiciary Committee. That is generally how long in the last decade and half these hearings have gone on.

When Justice White was confirmed I am not even sure that the Judiciary Committee asked him to produce anything in writing. When Clarence Thomas was nominated he had to produce 36,000 pages of documents for the Judiciary Committee, responding not only to the overall committee questionnaire but also to separate questionnaires from individual Members of the Senate. That is how far we have come from 1962 when Justice White was asked eight questions by the committee, to 36,000 pages being produced on Clarence Thomas.

It is within this new environment that President Clinton will nominate his first Supreme Court Justice. So, I

want to offer some suggestions on the kind of an individual fit for the Supreme Court. Obviously, President Clinton has no obligation to listen to my views. He won the election and I am of the other party. It is his responsibility and none of us would deny that or want to disparage it in any way or detract from it. But in a coordinative fashion, you know, he hopefully will consider the views of those who even are not of his party. But if he does listen to us I think he will find that my thoughts transcend politics and party loyalty.

First, the nominee should be of great intellect. He or she should have a great command of the law. I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber that would disagree with that.

And, second—and nobody will disagree with this—the nominee should have great integrity. The American people should have confidence this nominee is above reproach and conducted his or her life in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law.

Third, the nominee must have the temperament for the bench. In this regard, the nominee should be fair and open minded. He or she should approach cases without bias, without predisposition. Some are calling for a litmus test on some specific issues, but let me caution against that. Is it fair to litigants who will come before the Supreme Court to appear before a Justice who has taken a pledge on a specific issue, just to satisfy maybe getting enough votes to get through the Senate? Is it fair to litigants to have a Justice who advocates a particular result in a case maybe just to get the attention and that last little hurdle that maybe he or she will have to get over to have the Presidential final decision to support this or that person.

Of course I hope we all think not, at least I think not, that there should not be a litmus test. A Supreme Court Justice is not on any particular team, Mr. President. When he or she dons the black robes that a Justice does, that Justice then becomes an umpire.

Finally, and maybe the most troubling for both Republicans and Democrats, is to what extent the philosophy of the judge plays a part in whether or not they ought to be confirmed. Of course, the nominee should understand the confined role that a Justice has. In the Federalist papers, Alexander Hamilton wrote that the courts would be the least dangerous branch of Government. We must remember that the Founders, like most Americans today—I believe—were suspicious of Government. In fact, on that very point there was a poll out within the last 2 days about 67 percent of the people in this country really expecting and wanting a smaller and decreasing role of Government in the lives of Americans.

So consequently the Government, as Alexander Hamilton may have thought

of it, had the potential to exercise its power to harm an individual's right. And so the Founders saw the Supreme Court interpreting law, not making law, being the least dangerous, the least intrusive in the process of Government which, in turn, then would put them the least intrusive in the lives of Americans, yet, without a doubt, the protector of the freedoms that were either written or unwritten by the people who wrote that document and/or in their minds as they thought about what should be the role of Government in our society.

But in the form of Government the Founders were establishing, the courts would be—again quoting Hamilton—“Least in a capacity to annoy or injure \* \* \* the people. He went on to say, “The judiciary \* \* \* may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but merely judgment.”

The nominee should feel obliged to decide cases within the four corners of the Constitution. The nominee that the President Clinton will propose should demonstrate discipline to stick to the facts and the law before him or her, and the nominee then should leave the making of law, legislating, to us or to the individual States.

These, Mr. President, have been my criteria evaluating nominees for the Supreme Court from Republican Presidents and they will continue to be my criteria in judging anybody that a Democratic President, including President Clinton, puts before this body.

I await the President's nominee. I look forward to studying the nominee's record and the confirmation hearings which will enable me to assess whether the nominee has the intellect, integrity, temperament, and judicial philosophy to become an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER].

#### SENATOR GRASSLEY'S REMARKS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, at the outset I congratulate my distinguished colleague, Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, for those very erudite and profound remarks.

I have had the pleasure, really the honor, to sit next to Senator GRASSLEY on the Judiciary Committee for the past 12 years, 3 months, and 22 days. I can tell you that he makes an outstanding contribution to that committee.

Senator GRASSLEY has an extra advantage in serving on the Judiciary Committee, and that is he is not a lawyer. And that is quite an advantage. I have said to Senator GRASSLEY privately, and now I say publicly, that he reminds me of another great nonlawyer Senator, Senator Harry S. Truman, in the quality of his observations, his

analyses, and his conclusions, unfettered by all the years of law school or all the years of practicing law.

It is a distinct pleasure to sit next to him on the committee. While we do not agree on all matters, there is a good bit of overlap in our thinking. The only area of real tension, of disagreement probably between the two of us is—and this is to Senator GRASSLEY's disadvantage—he is frequently mistaken for me. People think that he is Arlen Specter instead of Senator GRASSLEY, and that is quite a burden to carry in Washington and perhaps even to some extent in Iowa.

He told me about last year, in the election cycle, one of his voters castigating him for his role in the Justice Thomas hearings. Senator GRASSLEY said he defended himself by saying he only asked one question. The constituent said, “Senator Specter, you did ask more than one question.” When the constituent was convinced it was Senator GRASSLEY, the constituent said, “That one question was one too many.”

So those are some of the foibles and some of the problems.

I was on C-SPAN recently and someone criticized me for the Coke-can incident, and I said that was not me. I was not going to identify who it was. Later a caller called up and identified who the Senator was. I should say it was not Senator GRASSLEY either. It was not his one question.

#### THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I sought recognition not only to congratulate our friend, Senator GRASSLEY, because of the timeliness of his comments, but to urge all parties in interest to move to come together now to try to get a compromise and accommodation on the important issue that this Senate has just voted again not to invoke cloture.

As I have expressed on this floor on a number of occasions, it is my conclusion that we do not need an emergency appropriations bill because I do not believe that there is an emergency and have specified in some detail in prior statements an analysis of all the accounts where there are funds presently available: Community development block grants, \$8.8 billion, summer jobs, highways, and right down the line.

But in the spirit of compromise, I have supported what Senator HATFIELD has proposed, which is a \$6 billion program; \$4 billion for unemployment compensation extension and \$2 billion in other programs. I think that is a good starting point on the Republican side of the aisle to try to come together.

Earlier today, I said on this floor that I had called the White House early this morning and had spoken to a White House official—I had sought the



President, but he was not available—and had urged that there be a meeting convened with the President, Senator MITCHELL, Senator DOLE, the leaders, to try to hammer out a solution. I made that statement shortly after 9:30 in morning business. I have since had a chance to talk to the President and have repeated that suggestion.

Mr. President, the pending legislation is important. Of even greater importance is what the American people think about what is happening in Washington. There is a consistent view by the American people that gridlock controls the Congress and relations between the Congress and the executive branch, and regrettably I think there is something to that.

I had said on the floor back in November of 1991, urging that we stay through on the Christmas vacation into January to try to tackle the economic problems facing the country and that there would likely be 537 people out of work, 435 in the House, 100 in the Senate, and 2 in the executive branch.

We have seen a new President elected. There are many areas where barbs could be exchanged, where vituperative comments could be made about the way this bill has proceeded with respect to all parties' press releases, public statements, and the rest of it.

But I submit, Mr. President, that the American people are not interested in that. What the American people are interested in is a solution to the problems of America. They do not care whether it comes from Democrats or Republicans.

I have urged our leader, Senator DOLE, who is on the floor at the present time, to try to work it out, and I have made that request of the White House. I hope that will be forthcoming. Because the dollars are not as important as the confidence of America that Democrats and Republicans in the Senate can work together and the Congress and the executive branch can work together in the interests of the American people.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, has leader time been reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leader time was reserved.

The Republican leader is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO GOV. GEORGE MICKELSON

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Senators PRESSLER and DASCHLE spoke eloquently yesterday about the life and accomplishments of Gov. George Mickelson of South Dakota. They were absolutely right in saying that Governor Mickelson was a remarkable public servant, whose tragic death deprives South Dakota and America of a true leader.

Elizabeth and I were honored to call George Mickelson our friend. I campaigned for him and with him on numerous occasions, and believed that he was one of the dynamic rising stars in American politics, with an unlimited future before him.

George Mickelson was a man who devoted most of his life to serving his country and his State. It was a devotion that began at an early age, and was handed down from his father, who served as Governor of South Dakota from 1947-51.

After serving his country in Vietnam, George Mickelson returned to South Dakota, where he would work for the people of Dakota as assistant State attorney general, Brookings County State's attorney, a 6-year member of the South Dakota House of Representatives—where he served one term as speaker—and chairman of the State Board of Pardons and Paroles.

In 1986, South Dakota's voters asked George Mickelson to lead their State as Governor. And for the past 6 years, he has led South Dakota with innovation and great success.

He was a tireless fighter for South Dakota's farm families, for small business, for schools, and for the taxpayer. He was also a national leader in the debate over health care reform, serving as cochairman of the National Governors' Association Task Force on Health Care.

But first and foremost, Governor Mickelson never tired of spreading the word that South Dakota was a great place to live, to start a family, or to own a business. Indeed, at the time of the plane crash which took his life, he and other South Dakota business and government leaders were returning from a meeting where they were trying to save South Dakota jobs.

In this time of tragedy, South Dakotans are fortunate to be led by the experienced hand of Walt Miller, who served for the past 6 years as Lieutenant Governor for his good friend.

I know I speak for all Members of the Senate in saying that our thoughts are with Governor Mickelson's wife, Linda, their three children, Mark, Amy, and David, with the family and friends of the seven other victims of this terrible accident, and with all the people of South Dakota.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader yields the floor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BOSNIA

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I understand that the imminent fall of Srebrenica has led the administration to reexamine its position with respect to Bosnia. Unfortunately, after several long meetings, the administration finds that an acceptable new policy simply does not exist.

On Monday, Secretary Aspin told the Washington Post:

Everywhere you turn, the downsides are there. \* \* \* I have never seen a government program before with totally no good options. It's awful.

This Senator believes that the administration is experiencing some of the frustration that led British Prime Minister John Major to write: "It is the nature of the Yugoslav tragedy that solutions cannot be imposed from the outside." Indeed, our humanitarian efforts minimize the damage, but fail to stop it from occurring. Our sanctions and peace negotiations have had no effect on Serb aggression. Bombing supply lines or artillery sites would be likely only to entrench the Serbs further. It is even arguable that sending ground troops would fail because we have no clear goal in Bosnia, and certainly cannot sacrifice American lives to enforce an unjust partition.

However, the downside of one of our options—a lifting of the U.N. arms embargo—is not that the measure will be ineffective; it is that the measure worries others—some Europeans, the Russians, some Americans. Some of these concerns are legitimate: the United Kingdom is concerned about the safety of its peacekeepers in the region; the Russian Government does not want to increase the ire of its nationalists before the April 25 referendum; and all of the West is concerned about the collateral damage of escalating this conflict.

Some of these concerns are resolvable. The Bosnians, for example, would prefer arms to British peacekeepers.

But even if we cannot entirely remove these concerns, we should recognize that they are not preemptive, or at least not significant enough to prevent us from helping the Bosnians.

In fact, the risks of not helping the Bosnians right now, with this measure, may be just as great. If we follow the course of our current policy to its logical end, we will surely face pitfalls, some that might confront us for decades. The Serbs will win all of eastern Bosnia and a portion of Sarajevo. Then they will call for a peace agreement. If we grant them that agreement, it will surely ratify Serb success, and thus set a troubling precedent for other areas of ethnic rivalry—Azerbaijan, Moldova, Khirghizia, Transylvania, Kazakhstan, Georgia, the Baltics, Slovakia. The list goes on and on.

But just as important, we will have trouble enforcing peace in the Balkans. The Croatian Government waited less than a year before violating a peace agreement that rewarded Serb aggression, and its losses and suffering, while severe, do not match the Bosnians' plight.

Perhaps once this war is over, we will follow the only moral course available to us, and turn Serbia into a pariah state. It will hardly help our interests; we will still face fighting in the region. So far, sanctions have only awakened an age-old Balkan pride and stubbornness. Last December, Mr. Milosovic was comfortably reelected, and his country endures 250 percent per month inflation, 33 percent unemployment, and daily casualties. He now plans a major spring military campaign.

Furthermore, what will prevent the Bosnians from one day seeking justice by attacking unrecognized Serb enclaves? Could we contain Bosnian vengeance against a de facto state after the Bosnians have endured the most massive case of ethnically motivated violence since World War II? Most likely not. We will be confronted by a region where fighting will endure continually, perhaps into the next century.

The only solution that appears practical is a partition; but not a partition that rewards Serb aggression. Since no one wants to send in American troops, we have no choice but to give the Bosnians arms and allow them to fight for that partition themselves. In the meantime, at least they will be able to defend themselves.

But if the President remains concerned with objections of our European allies, I would ask him to consider the West's moral imperative for giving the Bosnians arms. In September 1991, we hoped to choke the flow of weapons to what we perceived to be a complicated jangle of ethnic hatred. That arms embargo has effectively punished only the Bosnians. It has preserved a battle pitting Europe's fifth largest army against a young, nearly defenseless, multiethnic state. Not only have we refused to help protect the Bosnians; we have prevented them from buying the arms with which they could defend themselves. It has not helped contain the fighting. It has not furthered peace negotiations.

We must be willing to abandon a clearly flawed policy. For a year now, we have lived with it, and the Serbs have gained almost all their goals. That the President is now at least considering adopting it has brought us closer to peace than at any time since the fighting began. For this, I applaud the President's efforts.

But as he now considers the regrettable nature of the options before him, I would ask him to consider for whom each of the policies is so terrible. Our current policy is punitive with respect

to the Bosnians; a lifting of the arms embargo is not disastrous for anyone—it merely makes the West uncomfortable. It is time that we put our concerns behind the Bosnians' concerns; that we abandon peacekeeping efforts, in order to prevent Sarajevo from falling as Srebrenica did this weekend; and that we risk escalating the war, in order to prevent it from continuing as a genocide. We should do so with United Nations' approval if possible, without it if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

#### THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I will use this couple of minutes to bring my colleagues up to date on the series of health meetings that I, and my staff, held during the recent congressional work period that was held. We had hearings in six different cities throughout the State of Louisiana. I will report to my colleagues that the results were most informative for this Senator.

People are anxious to know what the Congress is doing on health care. I think people feel there is a problem. They are not certain of the dimensions of the problem, how large it is. They are not certain what the answers are to solve those problems. But there is a real, genuine interest in my State, and I would suggest in all States, concerning the health care crisis that we have in America and what can, and will be done, to help solve it.

The hearings we held consisted of panels of experts in the health care field, people in the insurance industry, people representing the pharmaceutical interests, and probably most important—consumers; people who are not medical professionals but just people like the average American citizen who is concerned about health care. They want to know that they will have access to quality health care and they will have access to that health care at a value that they can afford.

One of the interesting statistics that was brought out during our health care hearings is how much the cost of health care in America has increased in a relatively short period of time. Back in 1970, as an example, what we were spending on health care, both public and private, was about the same amount of money as we were spending on education in the country. In 1992, just last year, we spent on health care in America, both public and private, the amount of money that we spent on all of education, plus all of defense, plus all the money we spent on running all of the prisons in America, plus all the money that we spent on all of foreign aid, plus running all of the food stamp programs, plus the entire cost of all the farm programs combined.

Is there any question as to why some people suggest there is a problem that needs addressing and needs fixing?

Our health care hearings brought out, I think, that most Americans, at least in my State, do not want the Federal Government to do it all. They would like a national solution but maybe they would not want the Federal Government to be involved in it, which seems sort of ironic to us. They do not want us to go to a government does everything system like our neighbors to the north in Canada have because they have heard, as I have heard, that there are many imperfections in that system where the government becomes the final insurer of everyone and all the doctors and hospitals really work for the government.

I think most of the people who testified before our hearings really would like a combination, a system that will work and they can afford and they can depend on. They want to be able to pick their own doctor and select their own hospitals so they do not have some Government bureaucrat in Washington telling them where to go in order to be treated. I think that makes sense and I think that is the American way. But clearly something has to be done in order to make health care affordable and everybody have real access to it when they need it, in a timely fashion.

We had the opportunity, yesterday, in a bipartisan manner, in the Senate Finance Committee, to hear Mrs. Hillary Clinton bring us up to date on the progress of the health care commission which she is, I think, so ably in charge of.

I was very impressed—I would share this with my colleagues—about the information she brought to my attention and to the attention of both Democratic and Republican Members on our committee.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] chaired that informal briefing. I think all of us were delighted to hear about the progress; that they are on schedule. It looks as if they are starting to move in a direction that I think is reflective of the desires of most Americans. I think that most Americans realize we are going to have some changes made; that there will be an opportunity to make some improvements.

I am delighted with the approach that Mrs. Clinton is using in bringing together all Members of Congress to be involved in this process. I was particularly pleased that our colleagues from the other side of the aisle, our Republican Members, were involved in this meeting. In fact, she has taken the time to meet with them individually, as she has met with Democratic Members individually, and brought us all together to have a report with some of the top staff that she had with her to report to the Congress through the Finance Committee, which will prin-



cipally be dealing with this issue, on the progress.

I am just optimistic that we have a real opportunity to get something done; that when they write the history of this Congress they will say that, yes, Congress was able to come together in a bipartisan fashion and address one of the most critical issues facing our country, because everybody in America is touched by what we do on health care. Oh, there are a lot of things we do that some people are affected by and some could care less. Half think we are doing the right thing; half think we are doing the wrong thing; and probably others think we should not be doing anything.

But I think on the question of health care all Americans are directly affected. Not one of us are not concerned about the quality of health care, our family, our children, our friends, our neighbors, and the treatment they get. So I think we have a unique opportunity in this Congress to enact legislation, hopefully in a bipartisan way, to come up with a plan that makes sense and we can adopt, and move on to other issues.

I think those people who are saying, "Well, I don't want to hear talk about a VAT or about a cigarette tax, a liquor tax to pay for any new health care program"—certainly it gets the attention of many of our Members when we talk in those terms.

I think what the administration is doing and I think should do is to talk about the benefits first, so people will understand that we are talking about a program that is going to guarantee comprehensive health care to every American, so that every American can have a health policy that they can utilize to take care of their needs; that that type of system would allow the Federal Government to probably do away with the Medicaid system at a tremendous cost saving to the Federal Government. If everybody had health care, then no one would have to be on Medicaid. I think that would be a step in the right direction.

How many small employers in this country would love to be able to not have to pay for workmen's compensation? We could do away with the workmen's compensation system if everybody had a comprehensive health care system they can depend on. How many small business men and women would want not to worry about automobile insurance for their employees and themselves who get in an accident and have problems? They would not have to carry that type of insurance if everybody had a comprehensive health care plan that would take care of their health needs whenever they were injured in a wreck, an automobile accident, and they would not have to worry about workmen's comp.

Small employers in this country are looking at premium increases of 20, 30,

40 percent, much of which has occurred because of the high cost of red tape in the bureaucracy and filling out countless forms. If everybody had one single comprehensive plan, we could eliminate a lot of that. We could eliminate a lot of costs, not by price fixing or price controls, but merely by improving the delivery system, eliminating the paperwork, eliminating the cost of Medicaid; and yet, at the same time, giving people what I heard from my hearings what they want, and that is security and quality care, and quality care at a value.

I think that is the goal of this administration. I think it is probably the goal of every Member of Congress.

I want to congratulate Mrs. Clinton and the Commission for the fine work they are doing. It certainly represents a great starting point. It is not written in concrete, it is not written in stone, but I do think it represents the best effort by a group of men and women who have studied this issue very carefully and have spent a great deal of time, long hours, and long weekends, working on this proposal that we are going to receive sometime from the middle to the end of next month.

I think it is a good starting point. I think many of the features they will recommend will be accepted overwhelmingly by this Congress. I think when we write the history of this Congress with regard to health care, we will be able to say that we met the challenge and we did the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana yields the floor.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] is recognized.

#### INTELLIGENCE BUDGET

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, last week the executive branch submitted to Congress part of its intelligence budget request for fiscal year 1994. This was an event many of us were looking forward to, because President Clinton had made a major campaign promise to trim \$7 billion from that budget.

If recent press stories are to be believed, however, we and the American people are in for a rude awakening. Last Thursday, the New York Times reported:

President Clinton has asked Congress for authority to spend even more money on spy agencies, satellites and other intelligence activities in the 1994 fiscal year than it allotted for 1993.

The story went on to say that the budget request for the National Foreign Intelligence Program was for \$17.8 billion, compared to \$17 billion in the current fiscal year, while the budget request for tactical intelligence and related activities would be roughly at last year's appropriated level.

Thursday's story included a classic example of budget spin doctors at work. Let me quote:

\*\*\* the administration has concluded that at least a short-term increase in \*\*\* intelligence spending is needed before \*\*\* deep reductions can be made in the budgets of the Central Intelligence Agency and other spy agencies.

Now, I have to ask, Mr. President, why does intelligence need "a short-term increase?" And what does "at least" mean?

The cold war is over, yet the intelligence budget is more than double what it was in 1979. Its growth was unbridled for a decade, and we have just begun, in the last couple of years, to pare down the fat.

Does U.S. intelligence need a budget increase today? This Senator's answer is, "No way."

Thursday's New York Times story noted some distress on the part of lawmakers and predicted a sharp debate on the intelligence budget. It quoted Representative DAN GLICKMAN of Kansas, the very able chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, as saying, "I'm not going to be thrilled about an increase."

I want to commend Representative GLICKMAN for his stance. He is not slamming the door in anybody's face, but he is sending a message that Congress had good reasons for trimming the intelligence budget, and that any budget presented to us had better be consistent with President Clinton's promises to the American people.

Mr. President, we are working with a new administration that I was delighted to help elect, and I have supported and will continue to support the administration even when I have some personal misgivings. But it gets awfully difficult when you read an Associated Press story on the intelligence budget that says:

The Clinton administration is \*\*\* hoping Republican support in Congress will help overcome outspoken Democratic objections.

I will give the President the benefit of the doubt and go along with some tax breaks I do not care for. I will accept passive loss changes for the real estate industry, even though I do not think they are right. I will even hold my tongue when western Senators are able to hold onto their precious mining and grazing subsidies.

But if the intelligence budget presented to us turns out to be nothing more than warmed-over George Bush, then I am off the reservation.

The New York Times story says that the total intelligence budget request will be about \$28 billion. I do not know what it will be, because the full request has yet to be submitted. But let us assume that the press story is right.

Is \$28 billion a lot of money? To those people who think only in terms of the total Federal budget, it may not seem like much. Even as a proportion of the

defense budget, it is only about 10 percent.

But \$28 billion is still more than the Federal Government spends on education and the environment combined. And as is well known, we just defeated an effort of this administration and many of us on this side of the aisle to pass a jobs program and an economic stimulus program of only \$12 billion, less than half of that \$28 billion. And to this point it has been defeated. It is more than twice what we will spend on putting Americans back to work if my Republican colleagues allow us to conclude debate on the President's stimulus package. And I will bet that it is even more money than Ross Perot has.

So it makes sense, Mr. President, to spend intelligence money wisely. Last year, when the Senate Intelligence Committee looked at that budget, we not only trimmed more than a billion dollars off it; we also saw that cut sustained in the defense budget, rather than being used to fund other programs. And the appropriations found even more to cut.

This year, as we ask Americans to pay more taxes in order to pare down the deficits of the cold war and the high-living 1980's, we have an even greater obligation to make sure that every penny we put into U.S. intelligence is money that is truly needed, money that will be spent wisely and effectively.

I will listen closely to see whether intelligence officials can make that case for a budget increase, but I will tell my colleagues frankly that for now, I just cannot believe it.

Let me turn now from the substance of the intelligence budget to the fact that its size is being debated. I may disagree with the administration over what the budget should be, but I am delighted that we are talking about it, so that the American people can influence that decision through our democratic political process.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the playing field for this contest is a bit tilted. When the administration decides to push for a bigger budget, they get to tell the New York Times all about it. As I noted earlier, the Intelligence Committee had not even received all of the budget when the New York Times ran its front-page story.

This article was preceded, moreover, by a March 14 story on an executive branch "campaign to persuade Congress to protect the Nation's \*\*\* intelligence budget" from the cuts being exacted in other programs, a story that quoted CIA Director Woolsey and cited "senior administration officials." Fortunately, the story also quoted Representative GLICKMAN and former CIA Director Colby, who saw room for "substantial cutbacks." I ask unanimous consent that the text of both those articles be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1993]

#### CAMPAIGN IS BEGUN TO PROTECT MONEY FOR INTELLIGENCE

(By Douglas Jehl)

WASHINGTON, March 13—Warning of crippling consequences to national security, the Clinton Administration has begun a quiet but forceful campaign to persuade Congress to protect the nation's \$29 billion intelligence budget from deep immediate cuts.

The Administration's unexpected protectiveness toward spy agencies that grew up with the cold war stands in marked contrast to the views of Democratic lawmakers who believe that the agencies' budgets should now shrink in accordance with both the collapse of much of the Communist world and Congressional cost-cutting.

The Clinton policy, critics both in an out of Government point out, would leave spy programs with roughly as many federal dollars as are devoted to education and the environment combined.

#### URGING DELAY IN CUTS

Nonetheless, the new Director of Central Intelligence, R. James Woolsey, has told lawmakers that it would be dangerously unwise in an unstable world to cut next year's spending by more than a relatively small amount.

The White House has not issued a final recommendation, but senior Administration officials said this week that Mr. Woolsey reflected its thinking in urging that any steeper cuts be delayed for at least the next few years.

The differences between Congressional budget cutters and the Administration reflect new tensions in a broad and unusually public debate about the future of American intelligence operations. After decades in which spy agencies spent two-thirds of their budget dollars to track the Soviet threat, no one disputes the need to settle on new missions and new budgets for the nation's vast spy enterprise.

But budget-cutting zeal has intensified disagreements about the pace and scope of change. More than at any other time since the Eastern Bloc's collapsed, Administration and Congressional officials say, the nation's spy agencies must newly justify their roles.

After tripling in size in the 1980's the agencies face their most direct assault from lawmakers who wonder why a shrinkage should not be similarly abrupt. As the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, Representative Dan Glickman, Democrat of Kansas, told Mr. Woolsey this week, "Times have changed."

Mr. Woolsey says he shares that recognition. As overseer of both the Central Intelligence Agency and the entire, far vaster intelligence community, he told the committee that in the coming months he would offer a broad plan showing how spies, satellites and eavesdropping operations might be put to more efficient use.

Perhaps as much as \$1 billion could safely be cut from next year's intelligence budget, Mr. Woolsey said. But he called on lawmakers to "avoid precipitous steps that may bring short-term budget relief but will cripple us in the long run."

Cutting too much too fast would be "disastrous," he added.

Other Administration officials predicted some minor wrangling in the weeks ahead as the Office of Management and Budget and others weigh in on final details of the intel-

ligence budget. But the officials said the decision to spare intelligence agencies from sharp cuts this year reflected an agreement between Mr. Woolsey and Defense Secretary Les Aspin, in whose budget intelligence spending is buried. President Clinton's national security adviser, W. Anthony Lake, also supported the decision, they said.

Mr. Woolsey and his allies contend that the pressure to reduce the intelligence budget quickly reflects a misunderstanding among lawmakers and others. If intelligence agencies' main cause came to be the cold war, they say, that should not obscure that the agencies were created with Pearl Harbor in mind.

Even without a Soviet Union, Mr. Woolsey told lawmakers, the United States must still reckon with a bewildering array of threats, from terrorism to North Korean nuclear weapons, and at a time of great instability in the world. What might seem dispensable now could quickly become essential, he said, and it would be particularly unwise for intelligence agencies to be forced to dismiss those entrusted with their most sensitive secrets.

"We know from experience how costly it can be to react too late," Mr. Woolsey said.

He urged that the United States maintain "core capabilities" across the intelligence spectrum and said careful deliberations would be needed to identify what those should be. He also said the agencies should be permitted to reduce their staffs through attrition, as it now planned, instead of dismissals brought on by large budget cuts.

#### SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

Mr. Woolsey's willingness to accept deeper cuts in the future appears more flexible than the stance of his predecessor, Robert M. Gates. He has also drawn influential support from others, including another former Director of Central Intelligence, Richard M. Helms. Mr. Helms, who served in the Nixon Administration, said recently that he believed that the changing world had left intelligence agencies with "more on their plates than they ever had before."

But other respected professionals in the intelligence community say there may be excessive caution. William E. Colby, who was Director of Central Intelligence from 1973 to 1976, said recently that he believed there was room in the current budget for "substantial cutbacks, particularly in the area of high technology."

"We don't need to worry about Soviet forces busting through the Fulda Gap anymore," Mr. Colby said, noting that monitoring troop movements had been among spy satellites' principal tasks. "We can go back to a much more relaxed and periodic look at the military forces of the world."

The responses of several Democratic members of the Intelligence Committee to Mr. Woolsey this week suggested he may have a difficult time winning them over. Even after the Director's warning, Representatives Nancy Pelosi of California and James Bilbray of Nevada indicated they would probably favor deeper cuts than Mr. Woolsey wanted.

And Mr. Glickman, while clearly sympathetic to Mr. Woolsey, gave him a stern lecture: "We want to provide you with the tools necessary to do your job, but only those tools which are absolutely necessary. We expect the community to reflect in its size and the focus of its activities the fact that times have indeed changed."

#### IN THE PUBLIC EYE

Because the intelligence budget remains classified, discussions of it have usually been



held behind closed doors. What is remarkable about the current debate is that it has been so public.

Even the C.I.A. has taken new strides toward specificity. As evidence that the agency was already changing with the times, a senior agency official said recently that its staff of Soviet military analysts had been reduced to 9 from 125. In addition, other Government officials have said that less than 1 percent of the C.I.A.'s \$3 billion budget is now used for covert action.

In the Senate Intelligence Committee, lawmakers who last year talked about the intelligence budget only in private this year have already disclosed the precise figure, \$1.9 billion, by which spending was reduced from its 1992 peak. Elsewhere, private experts have published authoritative accounts of how the remaining \$29 billion is now divided, with the C.I.A. and its estimated 19,000 employees accounting for only about 10 percent.

According to these estimates, most of the rest is spent on satellites, eavesdropping operations and other technical systems; about \$10 billion is devoted to military intelligence. The best-financed single agency remains the National Reconnaissance Office, which receives \$5.2 billion and builds the imagery satellites on which the United States relied to monitor Soviet missile sites.

Mr. Woolsey and other intelligence officials say such budget figures should remain secret. But they are being advised by some lawmakers that as they think anew about what intelligence can do, they should do more of their thinking aloud.

As Representative Richard A. Gephardt, the House majority leader, told Mr. Woolsey this week, the world "is growing increasingly impatient with security and clandestine activity."

Frankly, the Missouri Democrat said, "you have to sell your story to the American people."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1993]

CLINTON SEEKING MORE MONEY FOR SPYING,  
AIDES SAY

(By Douglas Jehl)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—President Clinton has asked Congress for authority to spend even more money on spy agencies, satellites and other intelligence activities in the 1994 fiscal year than it allotted for 1993, Congressional and Administration officials say.

The request is hidden in classified sections of the Defense Department budget that on the whole reflects Mr. Clinton's plans for significant cuts in military spending.

But the Administration has concluded that at least a short-term increase in the intelligence spending is needed before similar deep reductions can be made in the budgets of the Central Intelligence Agency and other spy agencies.

The new Director of Central Intelligence, R. James Woolsey, had signaled earlier that the Administration would oppose sharp immediate cuts in intelligence spending. But the request for an increase has surprised some lawmakers because Mr. Clinton had promised to slash intelligence spending by \$7 billion over four years.

Nearly all of the new spending, Administration officials said today, is to be devoted to launching one or more spy satellites that can take the place of several older ones, saving money in the future.

While some members of both parties have expressed support for such an effort, other lawmakers have privately voiced some distress at the proposal for an increase in the post-cold-war intelligence budget. The re-

quest is expected to be the subject of a sharp debate next week when members of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees meet behind closed doors to review the budget.

While the size of the nation's vast intelligence budget remains an official secret, Administration and Congressional officials disclosed today that it would total about \$28 billion if the increase requested by Mr. Clinton is approved. They said the previous estimates putting the figure at \$29 billion had been exaggerated.

Of the total, the officials said Mr. Clinton had proposed that \$17.8 billion be set aside next year for the C.I.A. and other agencies whose mission is to provide policy makers with information about the world. That request represents an increase at nearly double the rate of inflation from this year's final appropriation of about \$17.0 billion, they said.

At the same time, Congressional officials said Mr. Clinton proposed only minor cuts in the other component of the intelligence budget, the military programs intended to gather the information used in battle. They said that total remained about \$10.1 billion.

By comparison, after accounting for inflation, Mr. Clinton proposed a 5 percent reduction in overall military spending.

Administration officials have told members of Congress that the upward blip in intelligence spending will allow agencies to consolidate programs and make deep cuts in the years ahead.

They also argue that Mr. Clinton has not violated his budget-cutting pledge because his request represents a substantial reduction from the figure President George Bush had planned to spend in 1994. Mr. Bush had set aside \$19.0 billion for the C.I.A., the National Security Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office and other national intelligence programs.

Because Congress last year authorized about \$400 million more for intelligence than it finally appropriated, an Administration official said last night, the White House intends to portray its proposal as a freeze, not an increase, once inflation is taken into account.

The new Administration hopes such arguments and party loyalty might blunt any Democratic impulse to renew battles that party members fought and won with the Bush Administration to cut intelligence spending. But some Congressional Democrats have already made clear that they intend to fight the new request, even though it comes from a Democratic President.

An influential Democratic lawmaker who spoke on condition of anonymity said in a recent interview that the request for more money for spy agencies showed that the new Administration "just doesn't get it" in terms of gauging opposition to the proposal.

"This increase is just not going to happen," the Democratic lawmaker predicted. "They're going to get cut severely."

Even Representative Dan Glickman, the Kansas Democrat who is chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, said in a recent interview that he had not yet decided whether to support the White House request. "I'm not going to be thrilled about an increase," Mr. Glickman said, "but we'll have to see where the increases are coming from."

#### FIGURING OUT THE BUDGET

Further evidence of the proposed increases is in a public version of Mr. Clinton's 1994 Defense Department budget request.

While the unclassified document leaves blank the spending requests for specific in-

telligence programs, simple calculations show that a research budget includes a request for a \$150 million increase to be divided among the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency and the new Central Imagery Office, which handles requests for spy satellite photographs.

A separate Air Force procurement budget shows a \$570 million increase for a category designated only as "selected activities," a category that experts outside government said was used to disguise money set aside for the C.I.A. and the National Reconnaissance Office, which operates spy satellites.

Mr. METZENBAUM. If those stories are accurate, they give a reader a fair idea of the fiscal year 1994 budget. But officially, those budget figures are still classified secret. So, while the executive branch and the New York Times may assert that the U.S. Government wants to spend \$28 million for intelligence, we in the Senate are barred from telling the public how much of their hard-earned money we have been asked to authorize.

The secrecy accorded to the intelligence budget figure is, frankly, not befitting our democratic form of Government. And the same is true for a policy that says, "You can't talk about this, but we can leak it."

Congress has twice called upon the executive branch to disclose the budget figure beginning this year. It truly pains me that the executive branch did not take advantage of the opportunity afforded by its fiscal year 1994 budget submission to comply with the will of Congress as we expressed it last year. I worry that some officials may find it easier to leak information than to disclose it openly and honestly.

I recently wrote a pair of letters to President Clinton, one on the need to trim the intelligence budget and one on why the intelligence budget figure should be made public.

My letter on the size of the intelligence budget pointed out the tremendous increase in intelligence spending after 1979. I went on to note some of the areas in which intelligence spending could be reduced. These include wasteful security programs, tactical intelligence systems designed to meet threats that have largely disappeared, and redundant administrative support costs.

My letter on making public the figure for the total intelligence budget emphasized that the end of the cold war has removed any security justification for keeping secret a figure that discloses no truly sensitive information at all. Thus, there is no longer any legitimate bar to disclosing how much we spend on this function of Government.

The President was generous and forthcoming in his response to my letters:

He acknowledged the need "to abide by the letter and spirit of the law" and to "make the congressional oversight committees a partner in deliberations

regarding sensitive intelligence activities."

He reiterated his pledge to "save a total of \$7 billion over the years 1993-97" and promised "a budget plan that allows intelligence to pay its fair share in reducing the budget deficit."

He pledged consolidation and streamlining of intelligence systems and management, and said that it was "time to reevaluate the onerous and costly system of security which has led to the overclassification of documents."

And he did not reject the idea of disclosing the intelligence budget total, although he asked for time to evaluate the pros and cons and to determine his intelligence priorities before addressing this issue.

I was pleased by this response, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my two letters, one of which has been edited to remove all classified material, and of President Clinton's reply be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1993.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
The White House Office,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Both public and congressional reaction to your excellent economic program has made clear the need for additional budget reductions. I encourage you to subject the intelligence budget to the same rigorous examination that you apply to the rest of federal spending.

Intelligence spending now stands at [...] billion, which is more than double what it was 14 years ago. As you know, the intelligence budget is divided into two parts: the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), which includes CIA, DIA, part of NSA, and various smaller programs; and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA) budget, which combines the tactical intelligence programs of the separate military services. Both halves of the intelligence budget grew tremendously in the 1980s:

The NFIP budget rose 133 percent [from Fiscal Year 1979], before Congress began to trim it back. NFIP now gets [...], which is still an increase of 110 percent since Fiscal Year 1979.

The TIARA budget rose 141 percent from [...] 1979 to [its peak]. The FY93 TIARA budget [...] represents an increase of 98 percent since Fiscal Year 1979.

The intelligence budget has been protected far more than the overall defense budget. The defense budget—with all its pork-barrel spending—rose only 58 percent in real terms between Fiscal Year 1979 and FY85, and the overall rise in the defense budget since 1979 has been only 11 percent.

Recently the Congressional Budget Office published a book of possible budget reductions. Their suggestions included cutbacks in such TIARA programs as the FEWS satellite and SOSUS submarine monitoring, with an annual cost of \$650 million. The Senate Intelligence Committee has recommended similar cuts for years. But we lack jurisdiction over TIARA and there is still no effective cross-service review of TIARA programs in the Executive branch, let alone any balancing of those programs against other intelligence expenditures.

Cutting the NFIP budget without harming the national security may not appear as easy as reducing the TIARA budget, but such surgery is both possible and necessary. The National Foreign Intelligence Program is beset by duplication of effort that we can no longer afford, especially in administrative support costs. And the public's money continues to be squandered on feckless projects, from ill-conceived and poorly run covert action programs to [...] "economic security" intelligence efforts that are hardly necessary to the national security, and could even harm it. [...]

Streamlining the tasks assigned to the many NFIP agencies—accompanied by a cut-back in needless or conflicting security requirements—would result in substantial budget savings. As reported in a recent Community Management Review that was commissioned by then-DCI Robert Gates:

"The security system that underlies the entire Community is completely out of date and dysfunctional, and is the single greatest barrier to progress in realizing significant improvement in the management of the Community and its relations with consumers."

"Across the board the Community is burdened with too much middle management. The manager-to-worker, or headquarters-to-field personnel ratios are way out of line with efficient or effective management."

It is not easy to combat wasteful and inefficient intelligence spending, although the Senate Intelligence Committee tries to do this. Just as in other parts of the federal budget, there are advocates for every program. And not only are the details secret; even the figure for the total intelligence budget and the statistics cited earlier in this letter remain classified.

I urge you to make public the size of the intelligence budget. If there was ever a security justification for such secrecy, it clearly vanished with the Cold War. Congress has twice recommended, moreover, that you make public the size of the intelligence budget when you submit your Fiscal Year 1994 request in a few months. The enclosed unclassified letter reviews the debate on this issue.

In summary, there is amply room for further reductions in intelligence spending. Some of those reductions will improve the national security by making U.S. intelligence agencies more efficient, while others will eliminate unneeded or even harmful programs. I urge you to mandate these needed reductions in spending, and also to make public just how much of the taxpayer's money is going to the NFIP and TIARA budgets.

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,  
U.S. Senator.

FEBRUARY 24, 1993.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
The White House Office,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For the last two years, the Intelligence Authorization Act has included the following provision regarding intelligence budget disclosure:

"It is the sense of Congress that, beginning in 1993, and in each year thereafter, the aggregate amount requested and authorized for, and spent on, intelligence and intelligence-related activities should be disclosed to the public in an appropriate manner."

With the end of the Cold War, there is a new requirement to buttress public trust in U.S. intelligence. The old forces that once

assured a consensus on the need for secret intelligence operations no longer exist.

A limited budget disclosure such as that which Congress has recommended would be an important, and simple, first step toward creating a new basis for that public trust. I urge you to take that step and tell the American people how much of their tax money is devoted to intelligence activities.

The arguments against any budget disclosure are old and discredited. A few people still fear that the disclosure of even one or two numbers will give our enemies useful information that they would not otherwise get. But Admiral Bobby Inman and others have assured the Senate Intelligence Committee that this is highly unlikely.

The intelligence budget total has been called the worst-kept secret in town, moreover, and of course that's true. Last year, in the heat of battle, intelligence officials and Committee leaders called its cut in the National Foreign Intelligence Budget both a \$1 billion cut and a five-percent cut, thus informing the public that the NFIP budget request was roughly \$20 billion. And last month, a Washington Post article based at least partly on an interview with outgoing Director Gates included a detailed chronology of the cuts made in the NFIP and TIARA budgets—to the nearest \$100 million.

Other people fear that a little disclosure will beget more—as though Congress and the Executive branch were incapable of reaching agreement on how much to disclose. But we reach agreement on far more sensitive matters all the time; that's what you and we are paid to do.

Some people in the Intelligence community worry that even such a limited budget disclosure will lead Congress to handle the intelligence budget as a separate item from the defense budget, and that this will lead in turn to lower intelligence budgets. Such results are far from a foregone conclusion, however, and many doubt that they would come about; indeed, some of my colleagues believe that disclosure will increase public support for intelligence funding.

The arguments in favor of limited budget disclosure are more basic. They begin with the premise that the American people should have access to information on how their government functions, when its release would not endanger the national security. The "Statement and Account" clause of the U.S. Constitution (Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7) speaks to this very point:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations, made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

People can argue over whether this clause requires the disclosure of the budget total for intelligence. The Supreme Court has avoided any decision on the issue, ruling instead in *U.S. v. Richardson* (418 U.S. 166) that a citizen lacked standing to sue.

There is no question, however, that Congress has the power to compel budget disclosure; both the Richardson dictum and Executive branch legal opinions confirm this. I do not doubt, moreover, that we could pass such legislation if we had to.

The real question is why any Executive branch would not, in this post-Cold War era, be prepared to make this modest disclosure on its own. Please take a personal interest in this matter and direct your Administration to comply with the sense of Congress on it. For, if the rhetoric of change cannot be translated into even this little bit of open-



ness, then we shall all have failed the test that you so eloquently propounded, to "scale the walls of the people's skepticism, not with our words but with our deeds."

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,  
U.S. Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, March 27, 1993.

Hon. HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR METZENBAUM: Thank you for your recent thoughtful correspondence on the intelligence budget and the need for creating a new basis of public trust regarding intelligence activities. I have considered your letters carefully.

The lessons of the past are well known. The failure of previous administrations to abide by the letter and spirit of the law or make the congressional oversight committees a partner in deliberations regarding sensitive intelligence activities led to disastrous consequences for the intelligence community. More importantly, it led to a crisis of confidence on the part of the American people.

I am determined to avoid that path. We intend to work closely with you and your colleagues in the Congress to ensure that we build an intelligence community that is ready for the challenging intelligence missions of the next century and not the last one. The Cold War is over, and both the American public and the imperatives of security demand that we must move beyond our historical focus on the old Soviet military target. But we must also act on the assumption that the new threats and opportunities require dexterous and well-grounded intelligence.

It is clear that the intelligence community must do more with limited resources. As I promised during the campaign, we will save a total of \$7 billion over the years 1993-1997 from the previous administration's request for national and tactical intelligence programs.

The Director of Central Intelligence is reviewing ways to consolidate the operation of costly collection systems and to streamline the management of the intelligence community. In addition, under the auspices of the National Security Council, we are engaged in an effort to redefine both our national security priorities and the appropriate role for the intelligence community in meeting new threats and challenges.

I know that the congressional oversight committees also will conduct a thorough evaluation of these difficult issues. It is my hope that you and your colleagues will be our partners in implementing a new long-term strategy that results in better and more cost-effective intelligence.

If more savings are appropriate, based on our respective reviews, I will work with the DCI and our oversight committees to ensure that additional reductions are carried out in a manner that does not impair our nation's security. I believe that a strong intelligence community is essential to the preservation of our vital interests.

I also believe in change. It is time to reevaluate the onerous and costly system of security which has led to the overclassification of documents. The result of our effort should not only be to save money but also lead to better security for our most sensitive programs.

Finally, I take seriously your suggestion that our Administration disclose the agree-

gate amount spent on intelligence when we submit our Fiscal Year 94 budget to the Congress. But as Jim Woolsey and the rest of our national security team attempt to structure new intelligence priorities, my hope is that you will allow us the opportunity to evaluate carefully both the benefits and legitimate concerns which are associated with such public disclosure. I will seek the views of other members and leaders of the Congress as well. At this point, before making a decision on public disclosure, we would like to take the time to establish new intelligence priorities and structure a budget plan that allows intelligence to pay its fair share in reducing the budget deficit.

I remain committed to greater openness and accountability. I hope that we can work together to achieve these objectives and that you will continue to share your thoughts with me in the weeks and months ahead.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. METZENBAUM. At the same time, I want to assure my fellow Senators and the American people that I expect the administration to follow up these encouraging words with real action. So far, the action seems to go in one direction and the words in another.

I truly hope that somehow the proposed intelligence budget for fiscal year 1994 will reflect new priorities and President Clinton's pledge of savings, and not throw away money on outmoded or undeserving programs while the administration searches for new directions. I also look to the administration to face up to the fact that there is no longer any shred of a security justification for continued secrecy on the budget total.

And it will not suffice to say that disclosure might adversely affect the intelligence budget. In the absence of a legitimate security justification, the norms of our democratic system require that the public be informed.

If necessary, we in the Senate should be prepared to enforce those norms. In that regard, I am pleased to note, Mr. President, a recent Newsday story, which was carried in the Columbus Dispatch, stating that "President Clinton has approved a proposal to allow the congressional intelligence committees to make public" the intelligence budget figure. I hope that is true.

The story quotes our esteemed chairman, Senator DECONCINI of Arizona, and others in support of this move, and I applaud my chairman for that stand. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that article appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus Dispatch, Mar. 27, 1993]

**\$28.5 BILLION INTELLIGENCE BUDGET IS  
HEADED FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY**

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. intelligence community, one of the last sacred cows of the Cold War, is heading for the congressional chopping block.

After 46 years of being hidden in the Pentagon budget, Congress is going to make public a limited overview of the intelligence com-

munity's budget, now estimated at \$28.5 billion.

Although some details are still being worked out, congressional sources said President Clinton has approved a proposal to allow the congressional intelligence committees to make public the overall intelligence community spending.

"It's going to happen," said Chairman Dennis DeConcini, D-Ariz., of the Senate Intelligence Committee. "I've dropped my opposition."

While the details may not be that revealing, officials of the Central Intelligence Agency and its critics predict the new openness will trigger unprecedented public debate on several activities, including:

Global eavesdropping by the National Security Agency, a U.S. military operation at Fort Meade, Md., where supercomputers are used to crack intercepted codes and sort everything from telephone calls in Moscow to missile telemetry from rocket tests by China.

Spying by satellites operated by the National Reconnaissance Office. Concern is growing over the need for the satellites, which cost about \$1 billion each.

CIA analysis that has become the predominant government view of world events and the foundation of U.S. foreign policy. In recent years, the CIA has missed events ranging from the dismantling of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union to the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

Both defenders of the community, such as DeConcini, and critics on the Senate panel, such as Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass., insist that sensitive information will remain secret.

"What's covert should remain covert," Kerry said.

Antioch panel member, Sen. J. Bennett Johnston, D-La., said public discussion would be "in grand terms. We won't be talking about paying agents to do certain things in certain countries."

But the debate is sure to lead to new cuts in intelligence budgets, say sources in Congress and the spy network. Clinton's economic blueprint calls for a \$7.5 billion cut over five years. The Congressional Budget Office has called for cuts of \$18 billion over the same period.

Sen. Howard Metzenbaum, D-Ohio, a member of the Intelligence panel, has taken the lead in pressuring Clinton to support a broader congressional debate. "Every member of Congress would have a say in how much we spend on intelligence," Metzenbaum said. "It's the American way."

R. James Woolsey, director of Central Intelligence, is opposed to the move. He argues that even broad-brush and limited public disclosure could lead to the unveiling of covert operations and sophisticated new technology.

"Once you pull the string, the sweater can unravel very quickly," said Richard Helms, a former CIA director who also doubted the merits of public debate. But Helms and another ex-director, William Colby, both predicted substantial cuts could be made in intelligence budgets that peaked in 1990 at an estimated \$31 billion.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Finally, let me assure my colleagues that I will keep pressing the executive branch to really combat overclassification of information. The current system, by classifying everything, merely encourages leaks like the budget story in the New York Times and erodes respect for the real secrets that require real pro-

tection. It also leads to senseless spending on security to safeguard information that need not be protected, against threats that often are no longer realistic concerns.

President Clinton concluded his letter to me with the statement: "I remain committed to greater openness and accountability." So do we, Mr. President; and I, for one, will do my utmost to help him achieve those important objectives.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:02 p.m., recessed, subject to the call of the Chair, until 2:42 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MATHEWS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

#### CRIME IN OUR STREETS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on something that is being discussed at the water coolers, cafeterias, and dinner tables around the country. That is the Waco situation.

As we all know, the incident at Waco ended very tragically for everyone involved. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to all of the people who have lived with this difficult problem for 51 days, and especially for the children who met a terrible tragic end, and who did not have a choice.

My heart also goes out to the law enforcement people who risked their lives to save other lives. It was a difficult decision for Attorney General Janet Reno to make, and I understand there were many complex factors to consider and it was certainly difficult for everyone who had to watch those buildings burn.

Now people are calling for a congressional investigation. Now the media is in a feeding frenzy to go and examine this situation in the most minute detail, and also within the Halls of this very institution and within Congress itself people are calling for a congressional investigation.

I acknowledge the tragedy of Waco, but I am calling for a different type of investigation, and I want to bring to the public's attention a different type of tragedy that is occurring, and that is the tragedy of the crime on America's streets. I want to know where are those who call for the congressional investigation on how we lost the war on drugs. During the previous administration, we surrendered on the war on drugs, and now our children are being held prisoners and hostages in their own neighborhood.

The kids in Baltimore are afraid to play jacks on their white marble steps, or to walk out after dark to go to a library, or to join a little league game because they do not know who lurks at every corner.

Where is the congressional investigation to talk about violence on our streets? Where is the congressional investigation to talk about the increasing tolerance for violence? Violence is everywhere and people are gripped by it.

Recently, I visited a middle school in Maryland to talk about opportunities for kids and to encourage them to stay in school. I asked those kids, "What do you want me to tell President Clinton, when I see him?" They said to tell the President to do something about crime. All they wanted to do was talk about crime and their fear of crime. Some are scared to go to school. Some are scared about what happens to them on the way to school. And some are scared about what happens to them in school.

How do we expect them to learn when they are worried about their own safety? How do we expect them to learn when we spend money on metal detectors instead of books? You know, when you talk to those young kids you ask them about their dreams, do they dream about being a police officer, a firefighter, or a mayor, or a Senator? Well, they do not know if they can ever be that, but when they look down the street they know what a drug dealer looks like. They know more about drug dealers than they know about many other aspects of American life.

Yes, Waco was a tragedy, but in my own hometown, on the weekend of Holy Week we had 12 people shot at one time on a city street during a dice game, and while they were on the ground bleeding, waiting for the ambulance to come, people rifled their pockets and even stole from the victims. And during the same 2-week period we had a nun strangled in her own convent. We had a Ph.D., a wonderful woman, dragged to her death in a carjacking in

a Maryland suburb, and we had a woman beaten to death in a home she lived in for so many years when she was one of the first African-Americans to be able to buy a home in that neighborhood.

Every one of these instances is a tragedy. And I tell you every one of those instances is as tragic as Waco. And where is the congressional investigation into that?

Last year, the crime bill languished over lawyer-like discussions on habeas corpus. I do not know about habeas but I know the corpses are lying right now in the streets of Baltimore and in the streets of other American communities.

We need to do something about crime. We need to do something about violence. We need to do something about dealing with the growing tolerance for violence. Now the shocking is becoming ordinary. I think that is intolerable, and I am not talking about more programs or adding more bureaucracy. This is not to be solved by technocrats.

Yes, I do think it will be solved by more police, and we ought to get cracking on that crime bill. Yes, I do think it will be solved by more teachers and more public libraries. And I think we need less violence on TV and stronger community ties.

We have to take a stand right here in the U.S. Senate. We have to find a way to contain crime and at the same time we need to reward those who practice self-help. We have to find a way to take care of those people who say "yes" to school and homework and are doing the right thing, and say "no" to crime and drugs.

I am talking about everyone getting involved, people not only in the cities but the suburbs and our rural areas as well.

We need to take responsibility for making all of our streets and our neighborhoods safe again. Let it begin in the U.S. Senate. Let us pass a crime control bill and maybe if we had gun control they could not have built up that arsenal in Waco and the arsenal that we see in American communities.

I know about communities. Long before I became a U.S. Senator, I was a community organizer, and I continue to be a community organizer. It tears my heart out to see us losing sight of what is important. I fought for my city for 25 years. We began to turn that city around until we were eclipsed by the enormous amount of drugs coming into our cities and our communities.

We need to make those changes. Our communities are living a very fragile existence and what happens? We continue to obsess over the wrong news stories and go for the headline rather than dealing with the bottom line of what is happening in our communities.

Waco was a real tragedy and it went on for 51 days. But what is happening



in our streets is even a greater tragedy and it goes on every day, 365 days a year, and in every community. People are fighting for their lives, and the police department is trying to help them.

I am here to say we cannot be tolerant anymore. We cannot be tolerant of drugs, we cannot be tolerant of crime, and we cannot be tolerant of violence.

Violence needs to come to an end on our streets and in our neighborhoods. The glorification of violence on TV and in the movies should come to an end.

So now, as we call for investigations, as we do our fingerprinting, as we do our Monday morning quarterbacking, I say, yes, I am sorry that Waco happened, but I am sorry about what is happening to the communities in the United States of America.

Let us not pursue the headline. Let us pursue an American agenda to make our communities strong, our neighborhoods safe, and our children believe that the U.S. Government cares about them and is willing to put its money on the line and police in our communities and teachers in our schools.

Mr. President, those are my thoughts on the Waco tragedy. I hope the U.S. Senate has found them informative.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### A BARTER PROGRAM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is somewhat ironic that, on the same day that we in this body are unable because of a determined minority to move an American jobs program forward, in one of our subcommittees today we are discussing a financial aid package for Russia.

I understand the need that my colleagues and some others describe for a financial aid package to Russia and the other republics. We spent literally hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars—in fact, trillions of dollars—building a defense in this country to protect us against an adversary called the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is now gone. It does not exist any longer. Russia and other republics do exist in the Soviet Union's place.

Russia is on a move toward democratization. Democracy is flowering in Russia. And many make the point, appropriately, that would it not be a shame for us to have spent trillions of dollars to deal with an arms race, but to be unwilling to spend a fraction of that to help Russia become a stable country moving toward democracy.

Well, as we debate that issue in the subcommittee today and in Congress, even as we debate a jobs issue for America, I wanted to share with my colleagues some testimony I have sent over to the subcommittee talking about Russian aid.

The economic collapse of the Soviet Union poses a significant challenge for our country. We should and will be part of a group of nations that attempts to help Boris Yeltsin and others in Russia move that country toward democracy.

But there are several things we must consider as we begin to help the Russians. We must be frugal. We do not have money to give away in any significant quantity. We are running enormous deficits here in this country with an enormous debt, and so we must be frugal.

We must require other nations to do their fair share. We should not extend ourselves and then see the Japanese, or Germans, or French, or others absolve themselves of their responsibilities to help, as well.

We must make sure if aid goes to Russia, it goes to those that need help in Russia. We must target technical assistance to small enterprises. We must avoid pumping money into the bureaucracies of a country like Russia, and we must be flexible and do this the right way.

The reason I took the floor today was to talk about something that I have talked about for a long, long while since I have been in the Congress. It is something we have really not had success on, but I think and hope that will change.

One of our opportunities is to develop an aggressive barter program with Russia. In the mid-1980's, I got a law passed that is on the books in this country. It is the law. It says the administration shall conduct two pilot barter projects. But of course, the Reagan and Bush administrations were opposed to barter, so no such pilot projects were transacted even though the law required it.

What do I mean by barter? I mean that 10 percent of the world trade is noncash trade. It is countries moving goods back and forth on a barter exchange mechanism, the simplest form of trade. It is 10 percent of world trade and growing—growing very rapidly. And we in this country have largely not been a part of it.

Aid to Russia is an outstanding opportunity in my judgment to develop and create an aggressive barter program in which we move American grain and other commodities to Russia that they need, and they in exchange move to us the kinds of things we need such as oil and minerals and other commodities. That is what barter is, in its rudimentary form.

Some say the Russians cannot pay for food so they defaulted on \$4 billion of loans, most of it for food. If they cannot pay for it then why do we not

find other ways to deal with this? Instead of moving food to Russia and expecting cash payments which are not going to come, why not develop a barter transaction with Russia in which we say to them, "We will move American grain to Russia to feed hungry people. We expect then, in return, under a pilot barter project with you, that you will move commodities to us."

Let me just describe to my colleagues in the Senate some of the opportunities that exist. Obviously, the Russians need food, and we send them a great deal of food. But we need to send them a great deal more. We produce food in abundant quantities all across this country. In fact, one of our problems, people keep telling us, is we produce too much food. It is kind of an irony because 600 million people go to bed at night in this world with an ache in their belly because they did not have enough to eat, and we are told this agricultural machine we have in this country, the network of family farmers across America, is somehow a liability. That is nonsense. It is not a liability. We produce what the world needs. The world needs food.

What does Boris Yeltsin need, what do the Russian people need to keep moving toward democracy? They need to avoid revolution; they need to avoid having people come to the streets and demonstrate because they do not have the most basic of needs—food.

We have the capability of helping in that respect in a very large way. But we do not just need to send food and say, "We will send food and charge it. We know you cannot pay your bill so we will call it a default later."

Here is how we can do this in a much smarter and much more effective way. What we can say is:

We have a large amount of food and we are willing to share it in a barter program. Russia, we would like to get from you some oil and mineral products. You produce a lot of it. You have a lot of it available. Let us trade food for oil; let us trade food for rhodium; let us trade food for anhydrous ammonia; food for uranium, food for nickel, food for platinum, and food for cobalt and cobalt products, and food for potassium chloride.

The list is almost endless of the kinds of natural resources and minerals the Russians have that we need. The list is pretty obvious of what we have that they need—food.

What I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture and the Clinton administration and this Congress to do is connect a barter project in which we say to the Russians, "Yes, let us move ahead. We will move great quantities of food to Russia and you exchange for that food the kinds of minerals and strategic materials and commodities that we in this country need."

We used to be known in this country as a country of shrewd Yankee traders. What is interesting to me is if you look at our trade policies in the last dozen

years or so, they have been almost brain-dead policies. We have lost almost every time we have sent negotiators anywhere in the world to negotiate a trade agreement. They put their silk shirts on, and, you know, their Gucci accouterments, and off they go. And they come back and they have lost in 2 weeks. I do not know why. Do not ask me why, because we are supposed to be a nation of shrewd traders. We have demonstrated an incompetence that is staggering in the area of international trade.

Ventures in barter are not just applicable to Russia. I am speaking of a barter program, an aggressive barter program in which we, government to government, connect a capability of moving our food and our commodities, which we have in such great abundance, to places in the world that need it in exchange for things that we need in our strategic stockpile. It would open up substantial avenues of new trade opportunity and reduce our trade deficit.

Some of us who have served in the House and the Senate for a dozen years, and have been banging our heads against the door to no avail because nobody has been home on some of these issues, feel that there is some new hope and new opportunity.

We have a new administration, an administration that is interested in getting results. We have a new Secretary of Agriculture, whom I think is the most innovative, interesting person I have seen in that job in a long, long while. Instead of representing the grain exchanges or the big food giants—that is who used to populate the top of the USDA—now we have somebody who is a Secretary of Agriculture who comes from a background in Congress of representing family farm in Mississippi. What is his interest? Secretary Espy's interest is how do you construct a system that helps family farmers? That is the origin of all this.

But at the top level, then, if we have a family farm network in this country that produces food in such great abundance, and much of the world needs the food but has no money, why do we not find ways to connect them? I have great hope these days that with a new Secretary of Agriculture, a new President, and a new awareness in bodies like the Senate and the House, we will understand that there is a new approach we can use in reinventing trade policy to connect countries of the world with us in a network of noncash transactions called barter. Barter presents enormous new trade opportunity and allows us to move our most precious resource, one that we have produced in greater abundance than we can ever use—food—to so many people in this world who so desperately need it.

My hope is in the coming weeks, as we begin constructing from the sub-

committee hearing today some sort of Russian aid package, that a major part of that package will represent a progressive barter project, and an aggressive barter project, as well, with the Russians, so we can benefit both countries as we move forward.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONDUCT AND DEVELOPMENT OF NAEP ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 801, introduced earlier today by Senator KENNEDY, regarding education statistics; that the bill be deemed read three times, passed and the motion to reconsider laid upon the table; that any statements relating to this bill appear in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the bill (S. 801) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 801

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) of subsection (f), by striking “and 1993” and inserting “1993, and 1994”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C) of subsection (i)(2)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively; (B) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

“(iii) The National Assessment shall—

“(I) conduct, in 1994, a trial mathematics assessment for the 4th and 8th grades, and a trial reading assessment for the 4th grade, in States that wish to participate, with the purpose of determining whether such assessments yield valid and reliable State representative data; and

“(II) develop a trial mathematics assessment for the 12th grade, and a trial reading assessment for the 8th and 12th grades, to be administered in 1994 in States that wish to participate, with the purpose of determining whether such assessments yield valid and reliable State representative data; and

“(III) include in each such sample assessment described in subclauses (I) and (II) students in public and private schools in a manner that ensures comparability with the national sample.”; and

(C) in clause (vi) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking “paragraph (C) (i) and (ii)” and inserting “clauses (i), (ii) and (iii)”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (D) of section 405(f)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e(f)(1)) is amended by striking “1993” and inserting “1994”.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRAGEDY IN BOSNIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I am pleased to note the presence of my friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER, who is also here to discuss the issue of U.S. intervention in Bosnia. He and I have had several discussions on this issue over the past year, and I know that we are in fundamental agreement on it. I always have the highest respect and regard for his views, and it would be appropriate if the Senator from Virginia would like to interrupt my remarks at any time.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I am here to address the Senate on that issue as well. I thank my distinguished colleague, and I will listen to his remarks with great interest since our views are drawn from the same experience. My colleague has had far more combat experience than I in the particular area that I wish to address, but I accept his invitation, and likewise invite him to stay for a few minutes as I speak.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague from Virginia. I would like to point out that my friend from Virginia has for many years served on the Armed Services Committee. He has a distinguished background as former Secretary of the Navy and has a deep and thorough understanding of the elements which make up the tragic situation in Bosnia.

Madam President, I would like to begin by saying that no one can ignore the tragedy that continues to unfold in Bosnia. No one can deny that the Serbian Government and Bosnian Serbians are committing war crimes against Bosnia's Moslems and Croats. The cruelty we see day after day on television and in the media document a pattern of aggression that has gone on month after month and that has made a mockery of peace negotiations.

No one can ignore the very real risk that any peace agreement, if one is ever reached, will be treated by the Serbs as nothing more than a scrap of paper. No one can ignore the risk that Serbians will go on creating a greater Serbia using a peace agreement as a cover for their actions.

At the same time, we should be aware that there are no simple solutions nor easy ways out of this tragedy, this horrible situation in which we find these innocent people entrapped.



We all have sympathy and pity for the innocent victims of this horrible civil war. But, it is important for us not only to express sympathy and a desire to see this situation rectified as soon as possible, but to consider what is possible and what is not possible.

And, we have to carefully consider any option that may cost the lives of American men and women in combat.

I would like to point out that I have been a long and consistent advocate of air power. I strongly advocated the use of air power in the Persian Gulf. I stated on this floor prior to the beginning of Desert Storm that I believed that air power could and would play a decisive role in that conflict. I believe that the events that transpired during that conflict proved that the decisive factor in our victory over the Iraqi forces was the judicious use of air power and the impressive use of the high tech equipment associated with it.

At the same time, I urge enormous caution about believing that air power and technology can bring a cessation to the civil war in Bosnia. Air power is not a panacea and it is not a answer to every peacemaking effort. I fear that it is not the answer in Bosnia.

Yesterday, in the Senate Armed Services Committee the commander of all U.S. and allied forces in Europe testified categorically that no senior officer under his command felt or believed that air power alone could bring about a beneficial solution to the dilemma that we face in attempting to resolve the civil war in Bosnia.

This is a warning we all need to heed.

An escalation to the use of offensive air power may well lead to one of two consequences: First, escalating our present level of impotence and reliance on military symbolism, or second, dragging the United States into a military involvement that can only be effective if it involves the major use of land forces, even then the use of land forces might not be decisive and could entangle us in continuing a civil war in which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to identify the enemy and to protect our friends.

Madam President, the Senate floor is not the ideal place for a lecture on air power, but I do believe that some military facts of life need to be put on the record.

Let me be clear in introducing these facts that I am not advocating the use of land forces, only trying to inject realism into the discussion of military intervention in Bosnia. The fact is, however, that there is a broad expert consensus amongst the military planners working on this crisis—both in the United States and NATO—that we cannot use military force to bring an end to this conflict without the use of ground forces.

At the same time, there is no similar consensus over the amount of force that would be needed for peacemaking.

This lack of consensus is partly the result of the inevitable uncertainty in any use of force. It is also the result of the failure to agree on the final objective of any peacemaking effort: Whether its objective should be to protect the Moslems in their existing territory or to create a unified Bosnia.

The Supreme Allied Commander of United States forces in Europe said yesterday that a figure of 500,000 men might well be needed. Other reports indicate that the NATO planners feel a force of 6 division force equivalents would be needed. Quite frankly, there is really no precise way to tell how large a force is needed without committing ground forces to direct military intervention and possible combat.

A great deal will depend on intangibles like the seriousness of Serbian resistance. Much will depend on whether the peacemakers go in to enforce a compromise that all sides can live with or are trapped with the impossible goal of building a United Nation of Bosnia. The rules of engagement will be equally critical.

What is absolutely clear is that any such force must be prepared to fight. The 20,000 plus men in the present peacekeeping force have failed because of what has become known as the blue helmet syndrome, have failed because they cannot fight.

This lack of teeth in the present peacekeeping force has been made worse by Western threats to intervene that have had no real followup. We have fallen into the trap of mixing hollow rhetoric with inaction or nothing more than proportionate escalation.

If we do move toward direct military action, however, we need to be honest about one central fact. We have no way to predict the size, length, and casualties of a peacemaking effort. All we can predict is that a credible peacemaking effort involves substantial ground forces and that it has to be able to reinforce quickly to the point where it can create facts on the ground.

We also have to be fully prepared to react to the ability of the Serbian forces to rapidly redeploy their ground forces to reduce their vulnerability to ground attacks; our inability to separate targets from civilian targets; the fact that Serbian forces are already armed well enough to defeat the Moslems without major resupply; the ability of Serbian forces to escalate the fighting and take reprisals against Moslem towns, refugees, women and children; and to a similar Serbian ability to shift tactics to guerrilla and low-level war throughout the countryside and in small villages and enclaves where they do not need to concentrate large forces or use heavy artillery. Further, we must be prepared to deal with the fact that Moslems and Croats are not united, and we do not face a single set of ethnic conflicts.

We need to firmly understand the limitations of air power. For example,

some have suggested that it will be enough to use air power to attack Serbian artillery concentrations. Even if we could be sure that we faced only one enemy, we would have major problems in using air power in this way.

There are some vulnerable artillery targets today but they can be dispersed and/or dug in a matter of hours.

Bosnia is not Iraq. It is easy to conceal artillery from air sensors, to deploy in areas where there are many civilians, to shelter weapons, to take advantage of poor weather conditions and night, to fire and run.

There are many weapons and large stocks of ammunition. These stocks of ammunition have some times been dispersed for years because Bosnia was intended to be the Yugoslav redoubt for guerrilla warfare in the event of a Soviet invasion.

The Serbians control most of these weapons and supplies, and while the Bosnian Serbs are scarcely an effective force by our standards they are much better organized, equipped and trained than the Moslems and Croats in the Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Once this massive mix of artillery weapons is dispersed, it will take a mixture of air and land assets to destroy or suppress them.

The air component of such a force cannot be small. It will take advanced reconnaissance assets and precision all-weather air strike capability. It will take armed reconnaissance capability that must be kept in the air to deal immediately with any major outbreak of fighting or artillery attacks.

Even under these conditions it could take six attack sorties to suppress one gun, once the Serbs and other forces learn how to disperse their artillery weapons and move them rapidly. It often took in excess of 50 sorties in Vietnam to suppress dispersed artillery weapons, although we then used less precise weapons in good weather. There is no way to estimate how many more sorties it will take actually to kill one gun. If the Serbians then shift to using mortars, which will be an effective substitute for tube artillery in many cases, a peacemaking force could only be effective if it had excellent counterbattery radars and artillery fire capability that was able to rapidly suppress mortars as well as tube artillery.

Advanced attack helicopters would be helpful in many such missions, but this would mean a need to secure a base in Bosnia. Helicopters lack the range to operate from the outside and there would be losses.

More importantly, we cannot protect the Moslems by denying the Serbs the ability to use artillery fire near a few enclaves or major cities. The Serbians can easily change their tactics and methods of ethnic cleansing. They can shift to attacking and killing small Moslem towns, at night or killing refugees. They can infiltrate into Moslem

areas. They can escalate in ways that could easily destroy the effectiveness of any peace agreement as well as the effectiveness of any air strikes.

There is a very real risk that using air strikes against artillery weapons would end in converting the conflict to terrorism and guerrilla war against the peace makers, blurring an already blurred line between combatants and noncombatants beyond recognition.

There has been talk of escalation to other options involving air power and cruise missiles. All these options have some potential value. All involve major risks.

We already know that enforcing the no-fly zone can have some psychological impact. However, we also know that Serbian air operations have long since ceased to play a fully significant role in the conflict.

Hitting Serbian troop concentrations in Bosnia is possible, but many Serbian military concentrations are in urban areas and others are widely dispersed. Significant collateral damage to civilians and civilian facilities is likely. Infantry forces will be hard to spot. They will scatter and dig in. They can then conduct raids against scattered Moslem targets in the countryside or suddenly concentrate and engage Bosnia forces at close range where we cannot separate friend from foe or combatant from civilian.

As for using air power to destroy supply dumps and to cut off lines of communications, many experts feel that it is impossible to effectively destroy lines of communications and supply dumps without a major land component. We must again remember that Yugoslavia planned to use Bosnia's redoubt for unconventional warfare in the event of a Russian invasion.

There are up to 300,000 metric tons of munitions and supplies already dispersed in the area, most under Serbian control. Serbia has also already sent many additional shipments.

Cutting off lines of communications by bombing bridges, et cetera, presents further problems because the Serbians can move by paths or small unimproved roads, but the relief effort needs most key lines of communications more than the Serbians. Some experts believe that destroying key bridges and roads would actually make the plight of Moslems much worse, although the truth is very difficult to determine.

There is no way to determine the extent to which crippling economic and infrastructure facilities in the Serbian areas in Bosnia would or would not intimidate the Serbians into halting the fighting. Expert opinion seems deeply divided. It is clear that some civilians would be killed in attacking targets like powerplants, water facilities, refineries, and fuel dumps. We might incite all out Serbian attacks, and it is difficult to believe that any peace would not lead to new conflicts and tensions in the region.

Expert opinion is equally divided over the impact of air strikes on military and civilian targets in Serbia proper. Some feel that such pressure could be translated into an effective Serbian government effort to halt the actions of Bosnian Serbian warlords. Others feel that the 14-odd Serbian warlords in Bosnia would continue their aggression. Once again, civilians would be killed. Such attacks would also exacerbate the political problems raised by Russian affinity for Serbia.

All potential solutions to the crisis must deal with the fact that peacemaking efforts take time to implement and could lead to a new rush of killings as all sides attempt to gain position or settle the issue before new forms of intervention take place.

Under these conditions, the worst possible options are those with no clear end objective, that signal reasons for a new round of internal fighting, or that involve unimplementable threats of force or an inability to escalate if a given approach fails.

In saying this, I do not mean to imply that the situation is hopeless, or no military options exist.

Limited amounts of military force have succeeded in peacemaking, particularly when they have been coupled to near exhaustion of the participants and deployed to support peacemaking objectives that all sides can live with.

The problem is that there are no silver bullets that can bring an end to the suffering in Bosnia and any peacemaking operation in Bosnia is fundamentally different from the Gulf war.

We cannot blunder into Bosnia with air power alone without having to blunder out.

Any real hope of success requires a willingness to commit substantial ground forces to combat—knowing that we cannot predict the exact amount of forces required, the intensity of the combat that will follow, the role of Russia, or the extent to which Moslem and Croat will be divided against each other.

These ground forces should not be American. Bosnia is in Europe. It is ground forces, although Europe has so far refused to take such action.

I have no magic answer to this dilemma, but it is clear that any use of U.S. air power must be coupled to a clearly defined and achievable end objective as to how we intend to make a peace. It must be coupled to European participation in the air and to the deployment of European combat forces on the ground. It must involve European willingness to move from static peacekeeping to active combat, and it must be coupled to some prior understanding with the former Soviet Union. Any deployment of force must be coupled to an understanding that the Serbians will be able to create new facts on the ground while any peacemaking force is organized, and take many Mos-

lem enclaves hostage. It must be coupled to an understanding that such a peacemaking effort would risk shifting Serbian and possibly Croatian attacks to a prolonged guerrilla war, or create a requirement for a military presence that could last for years—as has been the case with many peacekeeping operations in the past.

Madam President, the late Maxwell Taylor, who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under President Kennedy following the Vietnam war, said there should be several criteria that this Nation must observe when it contemplates the use of force outside the United States. Among these criteria was that the mission behind any use of force must be clearly explainable to the man in the street in one or two sentences, that there must be clear U.S. national security interests involved, and that any such involvement or military operation must be of limited duration.

I would add one more criterion to General Taylor's list as a result of our enormous success in the Persian Gulf war: That any U.S. casualties must be minimal.

It is understandable that the American people want this carnage stopped. This feeling is a typical result of Judeo-Christian principles upon which this Nation was founded. It is a natural reaction to the concern and sorrow we feel for the suffering of innocent civilians that takes place day after day, week after week, month after month.

But, if we find ourselves involved in a conflict in American casualties mount, in which there is no end in sight, in which we take sides in a foreign civil war, in which American fighting men and women have great difficulty differentiating between friend and foe, I suggest that American support for military involvement would rapidly evaporate. The best intentioned beginnings only have meaning if they have good endings, and we could see a situation reminiscent of that of about 20 years ago when the United States left ignominiously from a small country in Southeast Asia.

My view is that we should do everything in our power to bring about a peaceful solution to this terrible agony that transpires day after day. At the same time, we should be very, very reluctant to embark on a military adventure where we do not know the best way to begin, where we do not know what we do once we are there, and where we do not know how to get out.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, would the Senator yield for a question or two?

Mr. McCAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WARNER. I am exceedingly grateful for the opportunity to appear with this distinguished American and friend of mine for many, many years who shared with me, together with his



distinguished father, several chapters of our military history. When I hear our colleagues call for surgical air strikes here is a U.S. Senator who is well-qualified to discuss with precision the complications of taking out the artillery pieces which seem to be the focal point of so much of the discussion now. All of us are deeply concerned about the artillery, the bombardments, the human suffering. But before we make such calls for air strikes, we should understand what is involved.

I ask my distinguished colleague the following. The first problem that a ground attack pilot will have to solve is acquisition of the target. Acquisition can be best achieved through persons on the ground who in the lexicon of the military paint the target so that the aviator can then direct his ordnance on that target. So that requires persons on the ground to paint it. Otherwise, you would have to bring in helicopters or other airborne platforms to paint the target. They are vulnerable then to ground fire.

Lastly, if you do not have the spotters on the ground and you do not have the helicopters, the only other remaining way to acquire a target is through the pilot's visual acquisition which is extremely difficult and highly dependent on the weather. The weather in Bosnia over 50 percent of the time obscures any ground observation.

The primary reason for my getting up today is to ask the Senate leadership to provide all Senators the same opportunity to learn as Senator McCain has largely learned through experience, and I have learned through other avenues about the difficulties involved with conducting air strikes. I went over to the Pentagon last night and spent 2 hours with the persons that would have to work on the formulation of such a military plan to make sure that my understanding of the situation was correct. They corroborated my views.

So I ask my friend, can he give a little guidance to those who are calling for a surgical air strike—what is a surgical air strike, what is required, and what is the likelihood successful strikes could be achieved in this environment?

Mr. McCain. I thank my friend from Virginia for posing what I think is one of the fundamental questions affecting our involvement, particularly in light of the fact that many of our well-meaning and well-intentioned colleagues have stated that air strikes would bring about some cessation in the terrible tragedy that is unfolding as we speak and would somehow bring about a cessation of either the attacks or the civil war that is going on in that part of the world.

As my friend well knows, and as he was briefed by experts in the Pentagon, a surgical air strike is something which is extremely difficult to carry

out in practice. We were only able to carry out surgical air strikes in the Persian Gulf because we had perfect conditions. We had a static and inflexible enemy deployed in a flat open desert. We had excellent weather during most of our operations. In fact, our effectiveness suffered sharply at the end of the conflict because there was not good weather. This had a significant impact on our decision as to when to end the hostilities.

Yes, we could go into Bosnia, and hit some artillery pieces. However, these people are tough, seasoned fighters, as my friend from Virginia knows. It would take a very short time for them to disburse their equipment to camouflage their artillery, and also employ a tactic which has become effective in recent years, to put their military forces into civilian areas, where civilian casualties would be inevitable if we truly tried to destroy such targets.

I remind my friend that during the Iraq war there was a brief flareup when the Iraqis claimed we had hit an infant formula factory. All of a sudden, the world press focused on the fact we might have killed some Iraqi civilians, and people began agonizing and wringing their hands. Well, there is no possible way that we could attack the military targets in Bosnia in any effective way without inflicting substantial civilian casualties.

I also say to my friend from Virginia that there are times when we must rely on the best military advice we can get. The military should not set national policy, but there is a time when they are the only real source of expertise as to tactics, and whether we can effectively carry out national policy, national goals, or national desires, with a given type and level of force.

I have yet to meet a military expert—as Senator Warner found out during his discussions in the Pentagon, as we heard from SACEUR yesterday, and as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has stated earlier—who believes that air strikes alone can be decisive. In fact, we hear just the opposite. Until credible military experts can come to the Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the American people, and say that we can succeed with the following detailed plan, we should not act. If they can present such a plan, I think that my friend from Virginia, I, and every other Member of this body will support it. Sadly, no such experts and no such plan has yet appeared.

I thank my friend.

Mr. Warner. Mr. President, if I could ask another question of my colleague. I think we pretty well have spoken to the question of the surgical air strikes. And the Senator raised the point with which I agree, as does every military person who has come before the Armed Services Committee. We had hearings yesterday; we had hear-

ings today on these issues. I asked General Steiner about the air strike option. He is the CINC in charge of our Special Operations Forces. Those are the troops we call into trouble spots all over the world. If we were to put ground troops into Bosnia—and I do not advocate that option—elements of his command, as he pointed out, would be among the first to go in. General Steiner expressed great concerns with the surgical air strike option.

I am concerned when I hear of persons who get up in this Chamber and elsewhere to advocate various military option for Bosnia—and it is on both sides of the aisle, well-intentioned person. And the reason I am using this time to speak to the issue today is that the President is now about to react to some of these calls for military action. We should take a long pause here in the United States Senate to acquaint ourselves with the actual facts, as Senator McCain and I have done in our committee and elsewhere.

The question I have is that some advocate the bombing of the bridges between Serbia and Bosnia. The Senator touched on that. It was pointed out to me that if you take out the bridges, you would not be having a great impact on the Serbian supply lines; but it is those same bridges that are one of the main routes for the transportation of humanitarian relief supplies into eastern Bosnia. Has anybody calculated the number of casualties we would take through starvation and lack of medicine as a result of the cessation of the peacekeeping and humanitarian relief activities?

What the NATO commander said yesterday was that peacekeeping operations and the humanitarian aid mission are totally inconsistent with air attacks by the NATO forces in which the United States ostensibly would be asked to participate. So the peacekeeping and humanitarian aid would come to a halt, and that would result in a whole new category of collateral—indirect though it may be—casualties through the absence of the food and medicine which is currently being brought into Bosnia over the same logistics routes that some advocate taking out.

So I ask my friend, in his own analysis, had he also considered the fact that if you are able, through sustained air operations—and this is not just a few sorties; this is day after day operation by many aircraft—if you are able to do some suppression of artillery then there remains the question of the mortars, which are doing damage commensurate in many respects with the artillery pieces.

As my good friend knows, air power cannot effectively deal a blow against mortars. It might by chance. I suppose if you take the B-52 and carpet bombed day after day, you might get a certain percentage of mortars, but these are

mobile and they can be moved in a matter of minutes. They can go into the caves and the reverse slopes and be hidden and brought back in a matter of minutes.

I thank my good friend. I was reading through the testimony of General Shalikashvili yesterday, and his comments were right in track with my friend's comments today.

General Shalikashvili agreed with Senator MCCAIN's assessment in the Armed Services Committee that there is no tactical bombing option that would persuade the Serbs to "change their ways." On the contrary, the general felt airstrikes would cause the Serbs "to dig in their heels."

That was in direct response to my colleague's questions yesterday.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I can make one additional comment, I will then be happy to yield the floor to my friend, who I know has very important comments on this issue.

Not only are there practical problems in conducting airstrikes in Serbia, which my friend from Virginia has already pointed out, but I believe that anyone who makes a proposal to use force should also have a clear plan or option to deal with the consequences if that proposal fails.

My question to those who are advocating airstrikes is what they plan to do if airstrikes fail to bring about the desired result?

I believe there are really only two options: One is to withdraw in failure and leave behind a worse situation than the one we began with. The other is to take a massive escalatory step, and use largescale ground forces.

Are those who are prepared to embark on surgical airstrikes, or nonsurgical airstrikes in reality, are we prepared to take this next step if airstrikes do not bring about a resolution of this situation? Are they prepared to commit U.S. land forces. I do not believe we should overreact to the lessons of any war. We should not overreact to the lessons of the Persian Gulf conflict. We should not overreact to the lessons of the Vietnam war.

But, my friend from Virginia and I remember that we did not get 500,000 young men, and some women, into Vietnam overnight. We deployed them over a period of years, beginning with a few troops here, a couple of air units there, and then Marines to guard the bases, and then some artillery units. We gradually escalated until we found ourselves in an unwinnable situation at the cost of some 50,000 lives.

So one of the valid lessons of the Vietnam war is we must know what the next step is if the step we currently contemplate fails. And, the American people must be told all these steps and their consequences before they are asked to decide whether to support the airstrikes or not.

They should be left in no doubt about the fact that the use of airstrikes is an

endeavor filled with risk. I also believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people would only support a European land involvement, not a U.S. land involvement. At least, that is what I am hearing from the people of Arizona.

Madam President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair. I appreciate very much my friend from Virginia and his incredible input and dedication on this issue, and I look forward to listening to the rest of his remarks.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I would like to just make one other comment. If I am in error, I ask my friend to correct me. He bears the scars of the Vietnam conflict, and he bears them admirably and with courage; a conflict for which, in the end, the military in large measure was held responsible. It was not the military's fault. Historians have proven time and time again it was the political structure and the failure of the people to rally to the support of the brave men like Senator MCCAIN which prevented a military victory.

What my concern is at this moment, if we incrementally, as the distinguished Senator states, take one military option, execute it, and then a second, and possibly a third, the military will be criticized when those steps do not result in an end to the conflict. We have asked them now to enforce the no-fly zone. It will soon be learned that they are doing the job; they saluted and they marched off. But there is testimony in the Armed Services Committee to the effect that enforcement of the no-fly zone will have minimal military impact on the war.

Our military, together with other brave militaries under the flag of the United Nations, is carrying out that mission as we debate here on the floor of the Senate. Now, if we go to another option, to perform surgical strikes, the military will salute and go forward. But I encourage my colleagues to listen to the advice of the military beforehand as to what is involved in such strikes. But they will perform air strikes if ordered to do so. And then what happens when that does not bring about any material change in the conflict or the human suffering?

I say to my friend, I do not want to see the U.S. military or the military of any other nation held as the fall guy for this problem; namely, that they followed the orders of the politicians, they followed and they did the best they could and yet the conflict continues.

The military warned us beforehand that such steps would have little military effect. Their advice was not heeded. Now, when nothing happens as a result of these military actions to bring about cessation of the fighting, I fear some will hold the military accountable and say they are the fall guy, and they are responsible for the failure to end the fighting in Bosnia. That cannot be done.

It is precisely as the distinguished Senator from Arizona said. If you are going to involve them in this option, after first trying the enforcement of the no-fly zone, then you had better find out from them other steps would be required from a military standpoint to bring about some cessation of the fighting in this troubled part of the world.

If I might continue, again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator would like time on his own, he should request it.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask recognition in my own right for the purpose to continue as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for as long as he wishes.

Mr. WARNER. Again, I express my profound appreciation for my friend and colleague joining me here on the floor.

The primary purpose for getting up this afternoon and joining my friend is to urge the leadership of the Senate to provide other Members of the Senate the same type of information that Senator MCCAIN and I and other members of the Armed Services Committee have received.

But before the Senators elect to join in calls for certain types of military action in Bosnia, I urge them to understand all of the implications involved in such actions. Because when, from across the ocean, and from this Chamber, particularly, comes the call to perform a certain military option, it raises the hopes—it raises the hopes—of the people suffering in the former Yugoslavia. It raises their hopes. They think, the Yanks are coming; they are going to come and help us.

Air strikes, surgical air strikes are being held up as a solution to the problem in Bosnia. Senator MCCAIN and I know that the air strikes alone will not do it. Just look at the experience of Vietnam. We conducted air strikes for 7 years. In the Korean war, in which I had a role as a ground officer with an air unit, we bombed for years. Both wars ended indecisively. In the gulf operation, we bombed intensely before the ground operation started, and then for the 100 hours of the ground operation, we bombed consistently. But in the end, it was ground action which was required to bring about a decisive result.

So, when the statements are made, they raise hopes, false hopes both in Bosnia and here at home. Our citizens want us to see what we can do to stop this frightful murder. I just ask my colleagues to fully understand all of the implications of such actions.

There is no easy option. I commiserate with our President. I think our President is trying to do the best he can. Indeed, those around him—the Secretary of Defense, was quoted in the



paper yesterday as saying: "There are no easy options." For hours, the President and his top advisers studied every option. The meeting came, presumably, to an inconclusive result.

Perhaps we can come up with some concerted action with out U.N. allies to bring about an end to the fighting. But I just caution individuals not to get up and select one military option as the solution without fully understanding all of the military ramifications of performing that option.

In my discussions with many persons on this, it was brought to my attention very forcefully that if American airplanes, as a part of the U.N. force, start dropping bombs on the territory of the former Yugoslavia, that is an act of war. Is this institution prepared to declare war? These are the responsibilities we have to face up to if we are going to support the type of military action called for by some of our colleagues who advocate surgical air strikes. It is not some simple operation that will last only a matter of a day.

The military, if it is told to do this mission will tell you it will take a long period of time, with a substantial commitment of assets. There is a whole new political equation that will develop when the first airplane drops the first piece of ordnance on the territory of the former Yugoslavia. We will become belligerents in the conflict.

Peacekeeping operations become severely jeopardized if not halted. Our allies have told us that. That is the primary reason that those nations which have peacekeeping troops currently in Bosnia are hesitant to become involved in air strikes.

Casualties could come about very quickly. We should understand that. I have always taken the position in the various public offices that I have held, both in the Senate and in the Pentagon, that when you make the decision that a member of the U.S. Armed Forces should be deployed in a military operation, you had better be prepared, as a U.S. Senator, or as I did as Secretary of the Navy, to have the courage to go to the family of that service man or woman whose life may be lost, go into their home and tell that family why their loved one was lost.

That will not be an easy explanation, Madam President, in this conflict, a conflict that is so deeply rooted in hatreds that go back for a century or more, a conflict that is deeply rooted in religious differences, ethnic differences.

Several Members of this Chamber, including this Senator, have actually visited Sarajevo and have witnessed with our own eyes the indiscriminate firing. This artillery, which some advocate attacking with surgical strikes, is being fired mercilessly, fired mindlessly.

But if we conduct air strikes against that artillery it becomes an act of war, then the whole question is changed.

Peacekeeping, in all likelihood, would be terminated.

I have not seen any estimate of the damage to the civilian population by the deprivation of food and medicine and the inability to evacuate the wounded and the casualties and the homeless. All of that is likely to be drastically changed once the equation is reversed and the first piece of ordnance falls.

General Powell has made it very clear, as have other military experts that a military air strike is inconsistent with the peacekeeping functions now ongoing in Bosnia and that we can fully expect those functions to be diminished, perhaps terminated altogether.

So I simply close by asking my colleagues to take the time, as many of us have done, to study this situation ever so carefully before we go public with options which seem to us to have the hopes of some solution.

I hope that the intensity of this conflict, the horror of it, does demand more and more of our time, because perhaps together and in consultation with the executive branch—in consultation with that segment of the executive branch, namely, the Department of Defense, wherein the military experts are located—we can reach some consensus of what we should do to try to help in Bosnia.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that articles appearing into today's media regarding statements made yesterday before the Senate Armed Services Committee by our NATO Commander, General Shalikashvili, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1993]

#### NATO GENERAL IS RETICENT ABOUT AIR STRIKES IN BOSNIA

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The top NATO commander told Congress today that while limited air strikes might be effective in reducing the Serbian shelling of Muslim towns and cities in Bosnia, it is unlikely that they would bring the Serbs to the negotiating table.

The assessment by Gen. John M. Shalikashvili of the United States came as President Clinton and his top aides met today to discuss the fighting in Bosnia. A senior Administration official said that no decisions were taken at the meeting.

#### A QUESTION OF AUTHORITY

The Administration has said that it is considering air strikes and lifting the arms embargo on the Muslim-led Bosnian Government, among other measures, to help counter the Serbian attacks.

The question of air strikes has divided the Administration, with Defense Secretary Les Aspin arguing their merits while Secretary of State Warren Christopher has generally been opposed to the use of force.

As part of the deliberations, the Administration has begun looking at the question of

whether the United States and its allies would have sufficient United Nations authority to conduct air strikes without obtaining a new Security Council resolution.

Senator Joseph Biden, the Delaware Democrat who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on Europe, has argued that the United States already has authority to order air strikes under the Security Council resolution authorizing all means necessary to deliver humanitarian aid to victims of the fighting.

#### THERE MAY BE BETTER OPTIONS

But General Shalikashvili, appearing today before the Senate Armed Services Committee, argued that air strikes could have limited benefits.

Asked by Senator Sam Nunn, the Georgia Democrat who is chairman of the committee, if air strikes could be carried out against Serbian artillery, General Shalikashvili said "militarily, it can be done." If the goal of the air strikes was to reduce the Serbian shelling, General Shalikashvili said, "to some degree you can do it."

But the NATO commander questioned whether bombing could be used to force the Serbs to the negotiating table. "Perhaps it could happen, but I doubt it," he said, adding that he thought limited air attacks would lead the Serbs to dig in their heels.

Secretary Christopher also told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today that air strikes could have negative consequences, such as interfering with the delivery of food and medicine to civilians. "There may be better options," he said.

On the question of exempting the Bosnia Government from the United Nations arms embargo, Mr. Christopher said the embargo has "been to the great advantage of the Bosnian Serbs," and suggested that \$50 million already appropriated by Congress could be used to arm the Muslim forces.

In his testimony, General Shalikashvili said that arming the Bosnians would help make the contest more equal. But he also said that it would "raise the level of violence," echoing reservations voiced by the British and French Governments, which have said that an increased flow of arms into Bosnia could endanger the peacekeeping troops delivering humanitarian aid.

While the General gave qualified responses to many questions, he was sometimes caught in the crossfire of Senators who differ on the use of force.

Senator John Warner, the Virginia Republican, argued that the effectiveness of air attacks would decline over time, as the Serbs hid their artillery. General Shalikashvili said that he agreed with this point.

Despite his reservations, General Shalikashvili indicated that he felt NATO had been hemmed in by the United Nations when it came to enforcing the ban on military flights over Bosnia.

The NATO commander said that he would like to have had the authority to attack airfields if they were used to launch aircraft in violation of the ban. But that option was foreclosed by the United States allies on the Security Council, who are reticent about confronting the Serbs with force.

[From Defense Daily, Apr. 21, 1993]

#### CINC SAYS AIR STRIKES WON'T DOUSE BOSNIAN CONFLICT

A U.N. air assault on Serbian artillery pieces would be logistically difficult and would probably fail to encourage Serbs to seek a peace agreement with Bosnian Muslims, the top U.S. military official in Europe said yesterday.

While air strikes could reduce Serbian shelling of Muslims in the war-torn region, it would not likely "get Serbs to the negotiating table," Gen. John Shalikashvili, Commander in Chief (CINC) of the U.S. European Command, told the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Shalikashvili's remarks were a response to SASC members' questions about the possible U.S. role in quelling the violence in Bosnia. He said a surgical air strike would have only initial success, as Serbs would subsequently hide their weaponry.

"The days when artillery pieces were hidden in tree lines is over," he said. "Now we believe they'll be intermixed with the population."

Estimates of 500,000 ground troops, a number mentioned by Gen. Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as the numbers needed to enforce peace, are credible, Shalikashvili said.

The enforcement of the U.N. no-fly zone is going well, he added, noting that forces intercepted two helicopters Monday.

He also said interdicting Serbian supply lines into Bosnia would be difficult. Lifting the arms embargo against all factions in the fighting, while curbing the Serbian advantage, would take some time to take effect because the Muslims would need substantial training and the development of a support base, he added.

Shalikashvili appeared before SASC with Gen. Joseph Hoar, CINC of Central Command, and Adm. P.D. Miller, CINC of Atlantic Command. Among their top requirements, they said, were better operation and maintenance funding to keep a high quality of life for personnel, and improved command and control capability.

In response to questions about political instability in Russia, the CINCs said the Russians could never restore their Cold-War military might. Miller said the Russian navy has expressed interest in some cooperative exercises.

They also pointed to Iran as the biggest emerging threat to U.S. interests in light of its suspected nuclear weapon efforts and its recent purchase of a Soviet kilo submarine.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, that concludes my remarks. I urge Members to study carefully the remarks of Senator McCain, the distinguished Senator who speaks with a base of knowledge far greater than mine. His words deserve the closest scrutiny by the Members of this U.S. Senate, as well as the President and his advisers.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I have a communication from the Senate leadership asking that the Chair put the Senate in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the Senate standing in recess subject to the call of the Chair?

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:05 p.m., recessed, subject to the call of the Chair; whereupon, the Senate reassembled at 6:09 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. FEINGOLD].

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 61, Timothy E. Wirth to be Counselor of the Department of State, and Calendar No. 62, Winston Lord to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominees be confirmed, en bloc; that any statements appear in the RECORD as if read; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, considered and confirmed, en bloc, are as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Timothy E. Wirth, of Colorado, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

Winston Lord, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

#### ORDER TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION OF S. 171 ON APRIL 22

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of morning business on Thursday, April 22, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 57, S. 171, the EPA Cabinet-level bill, with consideration of that bill limited to debate only on Thursday, April 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

#### MODIFICATION OF COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute be modified to reflect that it include nothing but the funds for the unemployment trust fund, the text of which I will send to the desk.

The text is as follows:

That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute, as so modified, be agreed to; the bill read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; with the preceding all occurring without any intervening action or debate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, I do expect to say a few words, so I hope the two leaders will indulge me.

As the manager of the bill, I want to say some things. I have stood on this floor now for 12 days and defended this bill as though it were my own brainchild, defended it against attack, and attempted to keep it intact so that we would finally be able to go without a conference and send the bill to the President or if there were amendments, certainly, I had hoped there would be amendments of the nature that the House would accept.

Mr. President, this is day 12, I believe, of the siege of the President's jobs bill. An effort was made to break that siege when the Senate voted for a fourth time on a motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, this morning. Sadly, that effort has failed.

Yesterday, in a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Republican leader, Mr. DOLE, the other side of the aisle voted unanimously to appropriate, as an emergency, \$4 billion for a program of extended unemployment benefits. No offset would have been required for that \$4 billion; it would not have been paid for. It was declared an emergency several days ago. But it would have increased the Federal deficit; it would have added to our national debt.

Every Member on the other side voted for that amendment. What every Member on the other side of the aisle said by that vote was that an emergency exists in this country—an economic emergency of such magnitude that it justifies increasing our budget deficit and our national debt by an additional \$4 billion in order to finance a program of extended unemployment benefits. Yet, according to our colleagues on the other side, while the emergency we face justifies spending \$4 billion on unemployment benefits, it



does not justify spending one thin dime to create jobs.

We are entering the third year of a so-called economic recovery. It has been, and continues to be, an anemic recovery. Everyone in this Chamber agrees that it is appropriate for us to spend \$4 billion on extended unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed.

If we all agree as to the need to provide extended unemployment benefits, it would seem to me to be painfully obvious that steps should also be taken to create jobs and stimulate our economy. If long-term unemployment is so high as to make our regular unemployment compensation system inadequate, is it not elementary that we need to create more jobs to bring unemployment down?

Working men and women want a paycheck not an unemployment check—and that it is what this emergency supplemental appropriations bill was all about. The purpose of this bill was to put people back to work.

Yesterday, a new battle cry arose from the other side of the aisle: "billions for unemployment, not one cent for jobs," to paraphrase Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, during the XYZ affair that occurred during the early part of our country's history, "billions for unemployment, not one cent for jobs." That is the positions our colleagues on the other side have taken.

The Republican side of the aisle has taken its best shot. They have offered their amendments. Those amendments have failed. Yet, they have chosen to continue gridlock and obstruction and have prevented the full Senate from acting on the President's plan.

Obstruction has no place in this body if one is seriously concerned about the country's future. Is the politics of nihilism going to reign here for the next 4 years? Is a determined minority going to deny this President a chance to enact his program? Are we going to see this kind of roadblock to progress thrown up again and again during this Presidency? Are we going to see mail-in cloture votes over and over again? And we will get around, I suppose, eventually to just calling them in on the phone, have cloture by telephone.

The President's effort to create jobs and stimulate our economy has been killed in the Senate. And I use the word "killed" for a reason. It would be misleading to say that the President's jobs bill has been defeated. It has not been, may I say to the press. The bill has not been defeated. It has not been voted on. That would imply that the jobs bill was voted down; that it was brought to a vote and defeated. The fact is that the President's jobs bill never even came to a vote. A determined minority has killed, murdered, without even a shotgun, killed the President's emergency jobs package in the Senate by preventing the Senate from voting on it.

So instead of a jobs bill, we will have an unemployment compensation bill. The minority has said "no" to jobs, but "yes" to public assistance for those on the unemployment rolls. The Federal deficit and the national debt will go up by \$4 billion to pay for a program of extended unemployment benefits, but not one thin copper penny will be spent to create jobs and put people back to work. "Billions for unemployment, but not one cent for jobs"—that is the battle cry we hear from the other side of the aisle.

The minority has prevailed, but it has not won. For there is no victory in their killing of the President's jobs bill. Our economy is in trouble. Record numbers of Americans are today eligible for food stamps, Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC], and Medicaid.

Our unemployment rate is higher today than it was at the trough of the recession. Nearly 9 million Americans are officially unemployed, with 1.8 million of that number having been out of work for more than 6 months. Another 1.1 million jobless Americans have become so discouraged that they have given up looking for work. They are no longer officially counted among the unemployed. To the statisticians, they have dropped out of sight. Yet, those real people still exist; they cannot be ignored. An additional 6.2 million men and women are able to find only part-time work. All told, more than 16 million Americans are either unemployed, underemployed, or so discouraged that they have stopped looking for work.

We have heard vast volumes of rhetoric about the deficit on this floor, despite the fact that the deficit is reduced in the President's overall budget, and despite the fact that this modest jobs bill has been paid for many times over.

We have heard dry dissertations on Republican economic theory and ivory tower economic rhetorical seminars on how unwise it is to spend money to put people back to work. We have strapped on the green eyeshades here on the Senate floor and focused with laser-beam attentiveness on the evils of spending. But what about the misery caused by not spending to create jobs? What about the human cost and the economic cost of sitting on our hands while this so-called economic recovery sputters to a standstill? Have we strapped the green eyeshades on so tightly that we have cut off the flow of blood to the brain? What will happen to the deficit if unemployment stays at its current level? What will happen to the deficit if more and more people require unemployment benefits and food stamps? It will rise, that is what will happen. These bloodless theories about the evils of the deficit ignore the fact that to continue to do nothing to put people to work in this Nation will have the very likely effect of increasing the deficit.

One of every ten Americans is today eligible for food stamps. That is a national disgrace. Week after week, we see more and more evidence that the American economy is slowing once again. Yet, those on the other side of the aisle deny that there is an economic emergency sufficient to justify taking any action to create jobs. No, while they are willing to declare an emergency and provide yet another round of extended unemployment benefits, they will do nothing to put people back to work.

I am deeply disappointed and disheartened by what has transpired in the Senate with regard to the President's emergency jobs bill. An obstructionist minority has used the rules of the Senate to effectively prevent this body from acting upon a key part of our new President's overall economic program. No victory has been won today. The American people and the American economy have lost. How often during the past decade did we hear it said, "A rising tide lifts all boats." After today's action by the Senate, I fear the tide is on the way out for millions of Americans. We can only hope that those poor souls who have fallen out of their boats do not get swept out to sea.

Sadly, politics has prevailed in the Senate today. Reason has been shunted aside. Looking back at all the press releases and public statements emanating from New Hampshire, Iowa, and other corners of America over the last few weeks, it now seems obvious that the President's efforts to forge a compromise on a stimulus package were doomed from the beginning. With the next Presidential election only 3½ years away, I suppose it would be naive to think that our new President's economic program might be given a chance to work.

Politics has prevailed today. Gridlock has returned to the Senate. I hope the obstructionists are not too gleeful. For, while they may think they have simply blocked one of the three main components of the President's economic program, what they have blocked is economic progress. While they think they have trashed the President's jobs bill, what they have really trashed is hope for millions of Americans—hope that gridlock will end; hope that the economy will improve and that this Nation can begin to recover from the do-nothing policies of the past 12 years. While the other side is busy congratulating each other on proving that they are a force to be reckoned with—and they are—they have only proved to the American people that they are the guardians of gridlock. So, while the champagne corks are popping on the other side of the aisle tonight, millions of Americans will open a can of beans and a box of soda crackers and wonder where they are going to find a job. Make no

mistake about it, the hollowness of the so-called victory won today will not be lost on the American people. They will not forget.

Mr. President, I apologize to the leaders, and I thank them for their indulgence and their patience in allowing me to make these remarks before I state that I have no objection to the request.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest, as I always do, to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I will say that perhaps I have shared his frustrations sometimes in the past, but in this particular instance, I think there is a fundamental difference of philosophy that has brought us to this point.

With regard to the fact that we have agreed on the unemployment package, I would say that when the bill was before the Senate on March 3, 1993, 73 percent of the Republicans voted against that bill because it was not paid for, including this Senator; 23 percent of the Republicans voted for it.

Our view from the start has been we have had our fight on that issue and we lost. For that reason, we were willing from the start, willing a week ago, 2 weeks ago, to separate that package.

I would also add that there have been efforts to try to resolve some of the differences. And whether it was the amount of the package or the fact it was not paid for—well, those two things were the ones that we were concerned about. Some of my colleagues said, well, if you pay for it, the size of the package is not all that relevant. Others were just as determined that it ought to be cut radically, that that ought to be the paramount matter under discussion, not whether it was paid for. And others felt that they probably should just do the unemployment package, period.

But, in any event, after a number of meetings—and we had another meeting yet this afternoon—in an effort to address some of the concerns expressed by the President in the past few days, past 10 days, I did 30 minutes ago, 40 minutes ago, present to the distinguished majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, a modified alternative which differed from our package offered yesterday—which attracted four Democratic votes, I might add—by including the full amount of the President's request for summer jobs, \$1 billion; \$1 billion for highways; the President's full request for immunization, \$300 million; plus \$150 million for natural resources and \$100 million for the Small Business Administration, for a total of \$2.55 billion.

We also indicate, with the exception of the UI package, it would all be paid for with the reductions in agencies' ad-

ministrative costs. And we also permit, under our modified proposal, reprogramming of the CDBG request, because there have been some concerns expressed that while there may be \$8 billion available, there may be a shortage in some areas and maybe a surplus in others. So we recognized that and suggested maybe we should reprogram.

This Senator knows that we are going to be subjected to a lot of criticism from the President—have been already. In fact, today he said the Senator from Kansas did not want people to work and he wanted people to work. Well, I think that is a stretch.

My view is that we all want people to work. And we were very attentive to his concerns by including in this last offer the entire amount requested for summer jobs. We were also advised by experts, insofar as highways are concerned, that there is about \$718 million that could create immediate jobs in highway maintenance.

Immunization did not create many jobs, I guess 250, but it was a matter of some concern and certainly is high on the President's priority list, so we tried to accommodate him there.

But, having said that, this Senator will repeat that there is a fundamental difference.

We have had our problems in the past when we were in the majority. And when we were in the minority the past 4 years, the past 6 years, I can recall a debate here, I guess, last year where certain Senators, a bipartisan group, wanted to explore for oil on the Alaska National Wildlife Reserve [ANWR] and it was filibustered successfully by a combination of Democrats and Republicans.

The point I make is that a filibuster is not always a partisan filibuster. It might be based on where we are from—geographic areas; it might be based on bipartisan opposition to a measure; and it might be, as in this case, based on pretty much party-line opposition to a proposal.

If that is gridlock, then it has been around for a long time. It has a new name, but it has been around for a long time. It has been used successfully by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee when he was the leader. It has been used successfully by this speaker, the Senator from Kansas, and successfully by the distinguished majority leader, Senator MITCHELL. So it is not that this suddenly just cropped up since the election.

I do not believe the American people understand legislative gridlock. They understand traffic jams. I am not certain they understand legislative gridlock. But they do understand when you are spending money and spending money and raising taxes and raising taxes—they understand that.

I know it does not come as any great surprise to anybody in this Chamber

that there is not a great deal of confidence in the Congress in America. If you poll the American people about Congress, we would not be up very high. I think as individuals we would be up fairly high, but it is when we are together that the American people worry. And there have been polls on the executive branch and those numbers have been falling some, too.

So, notwithstanding that fact, I think most Americans—there may be some extreme partisans out there—most Americans want President Clinton to succeed. They want strong leadership. They hope they will have strong leadership from the President.

In my view, this is just a bad package. I told the President so a week after his inauguration. We talked about this package and he said it was not something that came up in the campaign. It was not even his idea, as I recall. It was suggested to him. He thought perhaps on the margins it might be helpful.

Is there any emergency in this package? Probably not. We could have the \$8 billion unexpended in CDBG's, we have \$1.4 billion in summer jobs. We have all this money out there that has not been expended. And we are told this is an emergency and, if we do not act, somehow we are depriving young children of immunization—as the President said at the Easter egg roll at the White House—we are depriving young people in the cities. We are accused—if any cities burn down this summer it will be the Republicans' fault. I guess we expect some of that. We do not accept it, but we expect some of that.

Having been on the floor several years now as Republican leader—and I appreciate that very much—I can recall times, time after time, when we were frustrated at not getting President Bush's economic package to a vote, and we made pretty much the same argument made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. We wanted our President to succeed and we want this President to succeed.

President Bush was blamed for the economy and lost the election because of the economy. And I guess no one will ever know, but if we had passed his economic program, things might have been different. Unemployment might be a lot lower today. There might be another occupant in the White House. But that is history. We cannot change that by what we say or what we do.

Finally, I would say this. This may be considered by some to be major legislation. It is important legislation, it is significant legislation, but in my view, if in fact this is the end of this package, it is just a bump in the road for President Clinton. He will be coming up here time after time after time with programs, looking, I hope, for bipartisan support. Maybe it is going to be the North American Free-Trade



Agreement, where we believe Republicans will be there with him. Maybe it is to deal with something else, some other domestic program or some foreign policy program where we believe that Republicans will be there, responsibly supporting what he suggests. So I hope the President will not think this is a finality, this is the end, and that Republicans cannot be expected to cooperate. I think that would be a big mistake.

Finally, I appreciate the majority leader's willingness to cooperate. We have been talking back and forth here for several days. But I think, as he concluded, there comes a time when you have to decide it is not going to work, it is not going to happen. He presented to me earlier today a proposal, a possible compromise. As I said, I met with 10 of my colleagues for about an hour late this afternoon and then submitted an alternative to the distinguished majority leader.

So in the view of this Senator, this is just one step. I will even share the expression used by my friend from West Virginia. I hate to use the word "kill," but I have had some of my legislation, the legislation of President Bush or President Reagan, killed.

I hope the President does not assume this is a defeat. It is not a victory—somewhere in there, somewhere. But the bottom line is we may not be right anymore this year. This may be the last time Republicans are ever going to be right on anything. But if I am any judge, I think the American people are supporting our position when it comes to this package. I say that based on what I have heard, not only from the far corners of New Hampshire and Iowa, but from other States like Ohio and Connecticut and Vermont and Kansas and other States that I have had the pleasure of visiting this past couple of weeks. These were not all Republican meetings. They were public gatherings. Maybe it is not deserved, but most people I talked to tell you one thing: Cut spending first. Cut spending first and do not raise my taxes. They are concerned about what they saw in the so-called economic package. They are concerned about new spending.

It seems to me we have made the right judgment. This time we prevailed, the minority prevailed. The minority does have rights. We do have rights in the Senate and there has been no stronger defender of those rights than the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. So I do not think anybody misunderstands that we are exercising our rights.

To some, we have made a mistake. But, in my view, the majority will say we did the right thing. And if the President tomorrow or next week can demonstrate to us that additional funds are needed, and if they are paid for in some of these programs, he will have the broad support of the Republicans on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

If not, H.R. 1335, as amended, is passed.

The motion to reconsider that vote is laid upon the table.

The bill (H.R. 1335), as amended, was read the third time and passed as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 1335) entitled "An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes," do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

*That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

*For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I disagree with much of what my friend and colleague has said, but I do agree that there is a fundamental difference in philosophy that has been demonstrated in this debate and the controversy over this bill. And that fundamental difference is whether we are to do nothing to deal with the problems confronting our country or whether we are to do something about them.

The view expressed by our colleagues is that the recession is over, the recovery is here, we should do nothing. Things are fine, let us do nothing.

Our approach is fundamentally different. We believe that with 15 million Americans unemployed or underemployed, with serious economic problems facing our country, we should—indeed we must—do something. President Clinton was elected to change the economic policies this country has been pursuing.

There was vigorous debate and disagreement during that election campaign and the result is history. The American people voted to change the economic policies of their Government. And that is what the legislation here represents.

Our colleagues do not want to change the economic policies of recent years. They wish to continue the policy of doing nothing.

That is the fundamental difference. Do the American people want their Government to do nothing? Do they believe that the economy is in good shape and things are fine? Or do they want their Government to do something, create jobs to get the economy moving again?

Let me address, if I might, the concerns that this program was not paid

for and that we must cut spending first.

The President presented a budget and the Senate adopted a resolution which is, in most respects, embracing of the President's budget that calls for a reduction in expenditures by the Federal Government over the next 5 years of some \$330 billion. That is in four major areas: Defense spending is down; spending in mandatory programs, like Medicare and Medicaid, is down; spending in discretionary domestic programs is down; and spending to service the national debt is down.

The President also called for increases in spending in some important areas, including this jobs bill, totaling \$125 billion over 5 years.

The net effect of the President's budget, as contained in the resolution adopted by the Senate a few weeks ago, is to reduce spending by a net of \$205 billion. Every single Republican Senator voted against that resolution which would have reduced the deficit, reduced spending by a net of \$205 billion, and when the additional revenues are added, every penny of which will go to reducing the deficit, cut the deficit by some \$480 billion over 5 years.

And so one may ask: Where was the concern for reducing spending and for cutting the deficit when we were voting on the budget resolution? This program is fully paid for in the President's overall budget and economic program. It is not paid for within the confines of this bill itself, and that is the approach being taken to pick the President's program apart piece by piece by taking each item in isolation and out of context to create an impression that contradicts the whole.

With respect to the offers, Mr. President, I think it is probably useful, and I believe the Republican leader would have no objection, if I ask that the two documents be printed in the RECORD. One is entitled "Possible Compromise." This was the proposal I made to Senator DOLE 5 or 6 hours ago. And the second is entitled "Alternative," and this is the one he made to me about an hour ago.

I ask unanimous consent to print those two documents in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposals were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### POSSIBLE COMPROMISE

(Mitchell)

	Budget authority/Obligation	Offset
UI .....	4.0	No Offset
Highways .....	2.9	Do.
Other job programs .....	6.0	\$5 billion Offset
Total .....	12.9	

<sup>1</sup> \$5 billion offset comprised of 0.51 percent 1993 across-the-board cut for \$2.8 billion in savings, and \$2.2 billion of 1995 outlays included under the 1995 cap.

Alternative (Dole proposal)		
Retains	Unemployment	Extension
and provide for the following programs:		
	In millions	
Highways .....	\$1,000	
Summer Jobs .....	1,000	
Immunization .....	.300	
Natural Resources .....	.150	
SBA .....	.100	
	2.5	

With the exception of UI, entire package paid for with reductions in agency administrative costs.

Permit reprogramming of CDBG money if requested.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I will say that in the possible compromise in behalf of the President, all of the spending, other than unemployment insurance and highway trust fund program, amounted to \$6 billion, and we proposed that it be offset by \$5 billion in cuts. So even beyond the fact that the President's budget has spending cuts in the net of more than \$200 billion, we offered to meet the objection to this bill by going, with respect to programs other than unemployment insurance and highway, five-sixths of the way. That was rejected and the alternative was presented to me which we rejected.

Mr. President, a jobs stimulus bill is not new in America and not new in this Senate. Ten years ago last month when Ronald Reagan was President, the Senate voted on a jobs stimulus bill that is strikingly similar to the bill we are considering right now; \$15 billion as opposed to \$16 billion, and many of the contents of the bill were the same, and most of the Republican Senators voted for that bill when Ronald Reagan was President. If it is such a bad idea when Bill Clinton is President, why was it such a good idea when Ronald Reagan was President?

Mr. President, this is a defeat, not for President Clinton but for the American people and for the American economy. I believe the effects will be felt in an unfortunate and adverse way. I respect the results of the Senate under its rules. I do not agree with those rules. I propose to change them, but will not be able to do so because our colleagues oppose such changes. But as of now, they clearly are acting within the rules and have achieved this result. That is regrettable, but we will be back. We are not going to give up on trying to find jobs for young people. We are not going to give up on immunizing children who need immunization. We are not going to give up on the other things that are in this bill that we think are important to the future of our country.

This is a defeat for the American people, but I hope and believe that it is a temporary defeat.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this is a sad day for the American people, a very sad day. I deeply regret that this jobs bill has now gone down because of the obstructionist tactics of the Republican minority in this body.

I want to be very clear as to what happened. A minority used the Senate's rules to prevent the majority from working its will. I do not deny that Senate rules allow this, although my own view is the spirit of the Senate rules is being abused by the constant and repeated use of the filibuster to prevent the majority from moving forward. The filibuster rule, which in effect requires 60 Members of the Senate to vote, in other words an extraordinary majority of the body to vote in effect to cut off debate or cut off amendments in order to get to a measure, is an extraordinary procedure and it has been used relatively rarely over the history of the Senate until recent times.

It has now become sort of a standard operating technique and has already been used by the minority in this country more than once simply to say that unless the legislation is written to our specifications, we are not going to allow you to consider the legislation; we are not even going to allow you to get to the legislation unless you frame it to satisfy our requirements. This is the minority talking, not the majority of the institution.

I know the other side thinks the recession is over. They think there are no economic problems out in the countryside. They think everything is fine and dandy. Let me tell you, Mr. President, the unemployment rate today is higher than it was at the bottom of this recession. Twenty-four months ago was the trough of the recession. The unemployment rate was 6.8 percent then. It is 7 percent today.

This so-called recovery is a jobs recession. We have not recovered the jobs that were lost in the course of this recession. We are struggling to try to get those jobs back, and the President put forward this jobs bill in order to give an opportunity to put Americans to work; a bill which included the summer youth jobs program, important transportation infrastructure, highway programs, mass transit programs, programs to address the updating, and the modernizing of veterans hospitals which is sorely needed to improve veterans' health care and, at the same time, creates jobs—construction of wastewater treatment facilities; other environmental measures; Head Start, Chapter 1; in other words, a whole range of programs that would put people to work and at the same time accomplish important national objectives.

Clearly, there was a majority within this institution for this program. If we had been allowed to vote on it, we would have passed it. We have been

frustrated now for 12 days on this legislation, both before the recess and after the recess. We have been blocked from considering legislation to put people back to work.

Then the other side says: "Well, this bill is not paid for." Mr. President, this bill, in the context of the President's program, which included the budget resolution as well, has been paid for many times over. The budget resolution has 330 billion dollars' worth of spending cuts in it. It contains 125 billion dollars' worth of spending additions including the original jobs bill which was before us, leaving a net reduction in spending of \$205 billion. Let me repeat that. The President's program included a net reduction of spending of over \$200 billion taking into account this jobs bill.

So, first of all, it is not accurate or correct to say that this is spending without any offsets. The offsets are to be found in the budget resolution which the Congress has passed and which the other side, the Republicans, voted against. They voted against the budget resolution that contains in it close to 500 billion dollars' worth of deficit reduction.

When Ronald Reagan was President and the Republicans controlled the Senate, Reagan sent to this body more than once supplemental appropriations bills, bills that were not paid for. The Democratic minority had numbers sufficient at that time to block the consideration of that legislation, which then-President Reagan said was an important part of his program. We did not do that. We allowed a vote to take place on those measures. We allowed the President to get a vote on his proposal. Of course, some people voted against it when it came up, but we allowed a vote.

That was denied to President Clinton in this instance by the Republican minority. They have denied to the President an essential part of his overall economic package. There are millions and millions of Americans who are going to suffer as a consequence of this, millions of Americans whose opportunities would have been enhanced and whose economic fortunes would have been improved.

I have listened to the debate carefully throughout the 12 days we have had this legislation before us. The President twice came back and said, well, I appreciate this resistance. I understand the rules of the Senate which allow the Republican minority to in effect take this special procedure ordinarily reserved for very limited use and make it a tool of party politics.

That is what is happening now with this filibuster procedure.

So the President offered to trim his package. His offer met with no response from the other side. The President offered to compromise, but the other side would not. The President



came down and essentially, the other side would not budge.

So there has not been, in my judgment, any real effort to try to accommodate the President. The other side even makes fun of the very program that they put into the law, the community development block grants. The mayors were asked to list projects that could be done in a hurry, to get jobs that needed to be done, and they had a big thick book of various projects they could do. The other side went through it, and they tried to extract out of it those projects they thought they could make fun of and proceeded to do so.

Now, the community development block grant was put in by the Republicans. It was the Republicans who wanted to give the mayors and the Governors the discretion to develop at the local level the programs that they thought were most needed in their communities. And it was under President Reagan that up-front review in Washington by the Department of Housing and Urban Development was eliminated from the procedure. So they are the ones who wanted local initiative and local discretion on those programs.

Most of those programs have worked extremely well. There are requirements that they have to be focused in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. They are essential to mayors all across the country in trying to deal with their problems.

The President has in his revised program a proposal to put more policemen on the streets of the country; a Federal assistance program in order to address the safety on the streets problem by providing grants for the hiring of additional police. That goes down with what has happened today.

The ability of the Small Business Administration to respond to requests for loans has now been severely undercut. The very small business sector which is such an important engine of economic growth in our economy is not going to be able to draw on the programs of the Small Business Administration.

The President had a defense conversion and a high-technology component to his job bill. That is now set aside, and our opportunity to address the defense-conversion issue and the high-technology issue has been lost.

Mr. President, the President carefully worked through a whole series of measures. I think we can show that virtually every one of them is essential to the future strength of the economy. They are needed to address pressing issues, economic and social issues. They would have contributed jobs and contributed to economic growth. They have now been set aside as a result of the tactics employed by a minority of the Members of this institution, tactics used to prevent a vote from taking place on the President's proposal.

In other words, we were precluded from even getting to the jobs bill so we

could vote on it. In effect, the minority said, unless the majority does it exactly the way we want to do it, nothing will happen. And nothing has happened.

I am sure we will have an opportunity in the weeks and months ahead to come to develop these various programs because we are going to be able to point to the deficiencies that exist in our economic and social fabric which these programs would have addressed and the difference these programs would have made in the lives of people all across this country, in community after community.

The unemployment rate today is higher than it was in the trough of the recession. We have recovered only about 50 percent of the jobs that have been lost. In every previous recession at this point we had recovered not only all the jobs that had been lost but had gone on to create many more jobs as well. There clearly continues to be a jobs problem. Yet, my Republican colleagues refuse to recognize that. They refuse to recognize that there is still a jobs problem out across the country. They recognize it to the extent that they will allow us to have the extension of the unemployment insurance benefits program, but no programs to put people back to work. We will extend the program to pay the benefits of the people who are out of work. You almost have to do that, otherwise these people fall completely off the shelf. Working people lose their job through no fault of their own and then do not know how they are going to be able to support their family and meet their house and car payments, and put food on the table. So, at least we are getting that program. But we are not getting any of the programs that create jobs and actually put people to work and give the economy some impetus so it can pick up and start moving and start hiring people again.

They say, these are public sector jobs. Are they public sector jobs? In my State, when they do highway contracts, they are done by highway contractors. The contract is put out by the public, but the work is done by private contractors. And the same thing is true of many of these jobs. The rehabilitation of the veterans' hospitals that would have taken place under this proposal would be done by private contractors, by people working in the private sector. They would have had to add on more people in order to do the work.

(Mrs. FEINSTEIN assumed the chair.)

Mr. SARBANES. There is a mix here of these programs, but all of them are designed to address pressing economic and social needs, and to put our people back to work.

This economic downturn is not over. I know the other side of the aisle thinks it is over. They said that all through the campaign. They never rec-

ognized that there was an economic problem. There is an economic problem, and there continues to be an economic problem. We need to address that economic problem, and the new President ought to have a chance to put his comprehensive approach into place to try to deal with it.

If he can put it into place and it does not work, it is his responsibility, and the responsibility of those of us here who supported him in trying to do that. But he has been denied that opportunity. And because he has been denied that opportunity, Madam President, in my view, the burden for the economic difficulties that I foresee lying ahead of us rests upon those who have thwarted the President from putting his program into place. The President was prepared to be held accountable. He went to the American people and said "I have a program, and this is my program in its entirety." He also said, "I need all elements of this program in order make it work." You cannot take a piece of it here and deny a piece of it over there and still expect to solve our pressing economic problems.

The President has fitted it all together as a comprehensive economic strategy. And the President was prepared, and those of us supporting him, to say with a lot of risks—because there is no guarantee in this business as to how things are going to work out in the economy—that he was prepared to be held accountable; in effect, to say if you give me my program essentially as I have submitted it, I am prepared to be held accountable for what the economic consequences will be. If it does not work, then we misjudged what was necessary, and we can be faulted for it. If it works, then on would have to say that our judgment about what ought to be done hit the mark, and the improvements that have resulted are the consequence of our program.

That accountability has been thwarted. The accountability the President was prepared to assume has been thwarted by the Republican minority who in effect said, no, we are not going to give you an important piece of your program. We are not going to let you vote on it. We never expected they would vote for it if we could get to a vote. All we wanted to do was get to a vote on the measure.

Just as in the first term of the Reagan administration when President Reagan sent supplemental appropriation bills to the Congress, we, the Democrats, then a minority of this body, did not thwart a vote on those measures. Some people voted against them. The other side had the burden of carrying them, which they did, but they were able to get to a vote. That has been denied to President Clinton by what has occurred over the last 12 days in this body—a practice now that is becoming more and more frequent. It was used 48 times in the last Congress.

Before we took up this bill, we took up the motor-voter bill, a bill which in the context of voter registration, is an important piece of legislation.

But in the overall context of the problems facing the country, the economic problems, the health care problems, and so forth, in my judgment, is not an issue that rises to the same level in terms of its importance. I do not want to minimize it within the context of the issue of voter participation in the election which is of course an important issue, but the economic issues and health issues are pressing in on the country. The filibuster was used on the motor-voter bill. The Republican minority said if you do not write the motor-voter bill the way we want it written, we are not going to allow you to vote on it. We are not going to allow you to get to the bill in order to vote on it.

Exactly the same tactic happened here. Who knows what is down the road? Obviously, a repeat performance lies down the road.

So, in effect, the Republican minority is saying we are going to reinstitute obstructionism in the consideration of legislative programs. We are not going to criticize them, point out their defects, try to change them and vote against them. We are going to keep you from even getting to them. We are not going to let you vote on them.

Mr. President, we are not going to give you a chance to have the Senate support or defeat, as the case may be, a major component of your economic program.

So the job bill now goes down. We get the unemployment insurance only. We do not get the Summer Youth Jobs Program. We do not get the transportation infrastructure projects, highway projects, and mass transit projects, matters really needed for the economic future of the country. We do not get the wastewater treatment facilities. We do not get assistance to small business through the SBA loans. We do not get some of these important programs with very important social objectives, like childhood immunization. We are lagging behind all of the advanced countries in immunization.

The President wanted to do an immunization program, and that has been denied. The President wanted to do programs to deal with AIDS, the Ryan White program; and that has been denied. The President wanted to do some advances with respect to housing, trying to meet housing needs of our people; and that has been denied. The President wanted to do programs to modernize and upgrade our technology to face the challenge of the future; and that has been denied by the Republican minority, denied again and again.

The Republicans have been denying the opportunity to make a change. The country wants change, but change is

not easy. Change is difficult to come by. This President has put forth a major program to accomplish change. He has put forth the program to bring down the deficit. He has put forth a program to invest in our future. And he put forth a program to give some stimulus to the economy and to restore jobs and get our economy moving again. The Republican minority pulled the plug on this stimulus and economic growth.

I do not know what tea leaves they are reading. The current economic growth is inadequate. It has not restored jobs in the country. Retail sales were down last month. People are worried about the indicators. There is a lot of concern about where the economy is going. They denied the President this job program to help give the economy a boost, a desperately needed boost in my opinion.

Madam President, I think as we work through these programs in the weeks to come, people will come to appreciate the opportunity that were denied to them in terms of the economic reinvigoration of the economy and in terms of addressing pressing economic and social needs in our country.

We are going into the summer. Many of these programs were essential to address problems that would occur in the summer in many communities across this country. Small business people are going to find when they go to the SBA, the window is going to be closed. The window is going to be closed, and they will not even be able to get their applications for loans considered because this program has not moved through.

So, it is a sad day for the country. The Republican minority has used these rules in a way that thwarts and frustrates efforts to move the country ahead. The losers in this situation in the last analysis are not the President and not the Democratic majority in the Senate, both of whom are always prepared to assume their responsibility. We were prepared to vote and be held accountable for it. In the ultimate analysis, we are not the losers.

The losers are the American people. The losers will be found in communities all across the country, who have been denied the economic boost and the momentum that would have come from this very important piece of legislation.

It is very interesting. The situation has reversed when there was a Republican President and a Republican majority in this institution. We allowed them—we being the Democratic minority—to get the votes on their measures. They were able then to carry the votes. They were in the majority. It was, in a sense, their responsibility. We allowed them to get to vote on the measure. We were never allowed in this instance to vote on the President's measure.

Ronald Reagan sent supplemental appropriations bills up here in his first

term. Votes were held on those and they passed. But President Clinton was denied even the opportunity to have a vote on his proposal. Forty-three Republicans signed a letter weeks ago, which said we are not going to allow you to get to a vote on this measure. You have to rework this measure to meet our specifications, or you are not even going to get to a vote on it.

That is the kind of constraint and obstruction and impediment that has been imposed on this institution. I deeply regret it, primarily for the American people, who are the ones who will suffer most because of the actions of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I, too, have been observing this activity for many days, as have, I hope, the American people. I want to commend the majority leader for his thoughtful effort to resolve this matter and, of course, our extraordinarily capable leader, Senator DOLE. I commend Senator BYRD, who is our instructor and our mentor. When he speaks on these issues with regard to budget matters, all of us listen attentively.

It has been a long process. I want to enter into the RECORD how long it has been and who took most of the time. We have spent approximately now 47, 48 hours on this issue. The Democrats have consumed 26 hours and 21 minutes. The Republicans have consumed 13 hours and 13 minutes. Who is fooling whom? And the reason that is so out of proportion is because we were unable to enter the amending process.

I understand that, and no one understands it more clearly than my friend from West Virginia. He has taught me much, assisted me when I served a time as Acting Republican Leader, and certainly in my duties as Assistant Republican Leader. We have had 13 days of consideration. We have had 20 roll-call votes in relation to this bill, and it all began on March 25. As I say, how can it be possible to even suggest that the Republicans were doing the filibustering when the Democrats used twice as much time?

That is not my understanding of the word "filibuster." Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but no one is entitled to their own facts.

Gridlock. I have heard that expression, and I heard it again today. I just gave the statistics from the front desk as to who has used how much time in this debate. Now let me give you the data from the Daily Digest as to whether we are involved in gridlock in this country, in this Congress, and whether the Republicans are involved in it. The Daily Digest tells us that the Senate has passed 102 measures since the convening of the 103d Congress. I think that is pretty good work. I think the American people ought to recognize that as pretty good work—highly bipartisan good work.



GEORGE MITCHELL, the majority leader, and BOB DOLE, the Republican leader, do work together and work together very well in an atmosphere of both trust and partisanship. That is what this is about—partisanship. The body has always been about partisanship. But we have now had 102 measures passed since the convening of the 103d Congress. That is not gridlock in any sense.

I have legislated now for nearly 30 years, sometimes as a citizen legislator, now full time. And I know my friend from Maryland has been a State legislator, and the Senator from West Virginia has been a State legislator. There is where we learned our craft, I feel. In that learning experience, there is one thing you must never forget, and you only forget it when you get arrogant or you get into the majority. And I have been in the majority and I have been in the minority, and it is more fun in the majority.

But there is a wonderful thing that you never, ever, ever want to forget, and that is: Be careful. I will put it in the most delicate terms: Be careful when you get in a fanny-kicking contest, because if you legislate, eventually it will be like that old Rube Goldberg cartoon of the great wheel, with shoes and boots on it and you just spin it, because you can do something to somebody when you are in the majority, and it will come back and hit you in the rump with a velocity that was unanticipated.

So as I listened to my friend from Maryland, who is a very bright, thoughtful, hard-working legislator, who has been a lovely friend of mine, and is, I thought to myself with a sense of irony and some fascination, that I watched the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], day after day after day in this Chamber, disseminating the policies of George Bush—a drumfire of ridicule, opprobrium, sarcasm—a drumfire that absolutely sounded like one of the Scotch tattoos out on the heather.

Nothing was supposed to work. Whatever did work was ridiculed, and many of the policies of George Bush simply languished in committees controlled by the Democratic Party, with a standard rule: Do not let him get that one, because if he does, he might get re-elected. So we will stiff him here and we will stiff him there, and we will go to the floor and do everything we can, day after day after day—that triumvirate that I speak of.

I understand that fully.

I must say that I had another surge of the irony that goes with the game, if you stay in it long enough. As I say, I have done it 30 years, and I have taken my lumps. It is a contact sport. I enjoy it because I am a legislator. I did not come here to defeat Presidents. I came

here to legislate. I like that. Legislating is very dry work, if done correctly. And you take on issues that are fraught with emotion, fear, guilt, and racism, and try to do your level best.

Interestingly enough, during those times I have had remarkable support from the Senator from West Virginia, especially in immigration, and from the Senator from Maryland, who added a great deal of thoughtful instruction in that debate and other debates in things I have been involved in, the Clean Air Act, Superfund, and so much more. That is what we are supposed to be here for.

We are not supposed to be here to cut ribbons, to be President or Vice President or whatever else. We are supposed to be here to legislate, govern, help the American people, and pass the laws in a way that, hopefully, is understandable to them.

I sat in this Chamber—if you want to pick up one issue, Madam President, that was totally and continually denied to President Bush with relish by, especially, my friend from Maryland—capital gains. What would have been the result if we had been able to pass capital gains tax relief? It would have released billions into the economy. And we had the votes, always had the votes. We knew exactly how many Democrats were going to vote for that package, and we knew exactly how many Republicans were going to vote for that package. The percentages might have changed. Were we ever able to get that to a vote? The answer is "No, never."

So to hear that plaintive kind of a keening wail with regard to how terrible this is, I can only conjecture what might have been. "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these, 'It might have been.'" And the Senator from West Virginia will know exactly where that quote came from.

So the capital gains tax languished here for years under a Republican President and a Republican-controlled Senate thanks to that side of the aisle. We had about 16 Democratic votes for that package always, 15, 16, 18, and it never saw the light of day.

Now that is called hardball. That is called politics, and we understood it. On the balanced budget amendments, line-item veto, votes were always there but always the books were cooked so that you never could get to a vote. They understand that. We understand it. The trouble is the American people do not understand it.

So what were we doing here? What is this exercise? The Senator from Maryland says that we will be accountable. Indeed we will be accountable, and indeed the President of the United States will be accountable without any question. Indeed he will.

So, what was presented to us in the budget resolution? The budget of the President of the United States seems terribly different from what I remem-

ber the campaign to be about. We lost the campaign. We will take judicial notice of that fact—done. And the reason we lost, we thought, was because the American people were saying cut spending and no new taxes, and no taxes at least on the middle class because that was the "promise of promises."

Well, from the "promise of promises" we now have taxes in this package of \$273 billion in 5 years, an energy tax which will reach into the home of every single citizen, and some plenty hard. And now on April 15 we have been advised, I guess in the form of a trial balloon, which looked more like a lead zeppelin, that we would consider a value-added tax, which is the most regressive tax that can ever be levied. It is hard to deal with, hard to define, but easy to find out who pays the bill. The consumer has two choices by the time it has been through five different value-added steps—either buy the product at a lot more than he or she would have or pay it.

So that was a present for us on April 15, the value-added tax, which is not being well received by some on that side of the aisle any more than it is here because it raises extraordinary amounts of money but will stall a country in its systems.

So when we came to this—and then, of course, remember, too, that there was additional spending in the package of \$124 billion.

That is what the President gave us in the budget resolution. When the Republicans were asked if you do not have anything to add to this, give us an alternative, we did. And Senator BROWN presented a remarkable plan which he crafted. It had some hard, tough decisions, and that was voted down completely by those on the other side of the aisle.

During my time here in the Senate, in the 14 years—I believe the Senator from Maryland referred to times when we were here and things occurred and they never halted us from going forward with proposals, allowing votes. I remember one remarkable string where I think we had about 47 straight motions to table our activities, whatever they were, 47. I think it was a grand record. So, yes, we got our votes and then we got them in a way which was tailored by the majority. That is the way it works. I understand that, too.

But the election was about no new taxes and cutting spending, and that was the pitch that was presented on that side of the aisle. It apparently had a good ring and it prevailed, and that is that. Now we have to make the country try to work.

And I can assure you we are helping to do that when we have helped pass 102 measures since the convening of the 103d Congress. But with the jobs bill, as this is called, we know the mantra of President Clinton—jobs, jobs, jobs. I

hope he can get there, but I do not think he will really probably match Ronald Reagan and George Bush, who gave us 19 million new jobs in those 12 years. That is a correct figure which is easily found with the Secretary of Commerce and others who deal with those statistics. Under Reagan and Bush there were 19 million new jobs created in our society.

So in 1983, when we did that package on jobs, and the President, President Reagan, presented it, yes, there were Democrats who supported that, and certainly there were Republicans who supported it, and I think we spent \$5 billion on it. And then remember, though, what happened. Back came the GAO report, back came some other reports. I do not remember which groups. Interest groups and agencies got into the tabulation. But it was found that for that \$5 billion we got 35,000 more jobs, 35,000 jobs for a \$5 billion price tag.

I listed that one under lessons learned, and we have all heard during this debate over the past 13 legislative days how much these jobs are going to cost. I heard figures range from \$30,000 to \$60,000 administrative costs, and so on.

So I would have thought that, for the \$5 billion we poured down that trail in 1983 and got 35,000 jobs, it was determined that it was money not well spent, nor will this be.

But let us recall what these Republican "rascals" just presented to the majority leader as our package. Our offer was that we will do these things and we will pay for it. I know that is an unheard of thing within the confines of the beltway, but it nevertheless is not unheard of outside of the beltway.

All of us have gone home in the last 2 weeks, and I can tell you that in my State people are saying, "Cut spending, Simpson. That is what you are supposed to be about. And why in the world am I going to end up paying 200 to 400 bucks per year per capita on an energy tax in a State that is the energy State with the No. 1 producer of coal?"

The Senator from West Virginia represents a very formidable producer of coal, second or third to the State I represent, and the energy tax is going to impact his constituents in a way, and proportionally more than any other tax could ever hit someone in West Virginia or Pennsylvania or Kentucky. Now that is the way that is.

The value-added tax, again, does not have any ability to adjust for progressivity. They cannot get there. And then to hear during the debate the issue of "people now will be out on the street after this activity," that really strains all the credibility that I can envision.

How about the people who are going to be out on the street because of the President's actions with the defense budget? Hundreds of thousands of peo-

ple will be out on the street, and those are just the military people. Then add that to the civilian population of every base in the United States, which is often a support system of a third or a half or 50 percent of the military, add that to every single National Guard unit, every reservist, and you really are talking about people out in the street. Now that is what is coming there.

Oh, yes, there have been discussions about what to do there. But that is the reality of what is coming; and it cannot miss but come.

And to hear the discussion of how people will fall off the shelf, to hear that these "rascal Republicans" have done this dastardly deed and inflicted it upon the country, I do not look upon this as "win or lose."

There will be a lot more things where I will be supporting Presidents, including President Clinton than I will ever not be supporting, and I have proved that up in lots of years of legislating.

Bring out the Russian aid bill and watch some thoughtful work by Republicans. Bring up the North American Free Trade Agreement—and I hope we can get that—I am right with the President and Secretary Bentsen on that one. You will find a lot of Republican help on that one.

It is unfortunate, and perhaps it is the media, too, who must—I think someone has to ascribe some comment to the only unaccountable branch in society, which is the media, who described this thing for 2 weeks as if this was the most vital thing that had ever been performed in a legislative body. What babble! This is a little tiny chunk of a huge plateful of stuff that we will deal with. But because we have been out of town for 2 weeks, you would think that this was the lever that would move the Earth.

Well, it is not about win or lose. I do not know how it will be reported. I suppose the headlines will be "Great Crushing Loss for the President." I would certainly tell him not to lose too much sleep about that; none at all, in fact.

It is not some great crushing loss. It is all something that has been whacked out of proportion, simply because if you leave town long enough they only have so much to chew on. And then it is like bear meat, the more you chew it, the bigger it gets.

So I hope we will not hear too much about the "horror" of what has occurred. And it should not be that we put things on the basis of "win or lose."

The President has discussed things with Senator DOLE, our leader, and he has told us in my presence and has told me, "We want to work with you. I like working with the minority. I did that when I was Governor of Arkansas."

Hillary Clinton, whom I admire greatly and who knows the glossary of

terms in health care better than many I have dealt with—and I am learning and have learned and will continue to try to help on that issue—spoke to our Republican Senators in a very adept performance that was authentic, and said, "I will be counting on you to help and I will be looking for your counsel." And then the phone never rang for 3 weeks.

Or the President, telling Senator DOLE and me and others, "I will be counting on you to help in a bipartisan way, to help do what we need to do to make our country work." And we said, "Great. We'll look forward to that." And the phone never rang.

Now, when I say that, I am not speaking as a person who is pouting. We are not off in the corner sucking our thumbs because we have not had a call. But we are saying, "Why don't you just spare us that?" It did get our hopes up and we were dashed there lightly—that is different than pouting. But rather don't say anything to us, just say, "Look, we are going to tough it out and do it ourselves and if we want anything out of you, we will call you." That would be better than saying, "We want you to participate" and then not call us to be involved.

But I noted, interestingly enough, that Senator CHAFEE and, I believe, Senator PACKWOOD and others participated in a recent meeting with the First Lady and her group, and that is very important. We can get a health care bill that is bipartisan without question. And if we do not have a bipartisan bill we will not have a health care bill. Not that we will be dragging our feet. No one, none of us, will know where to go.

We have 600 bills on health care and only 535 of us in both bodies, which means a lot of people have covered themselves twice, being able to go home and say, "I have a health care bill. Magnificent; what a thing."

Of course, they do not tell you how to pay for it. They do not tell you anything more about it at all. "Don't want to irritate the Chamber or AFL-CIO."

We have hard work to do. We have to whack on the AARP. Everybody ready for that? I am. We are going to have to do that; going to have to whack on some of these groups; going to have to whack on the veterans' groups who have a health care system that is going to have to be completely reviewed in this system, as we support the veterans \$35 billion a year. That is what we do right here and we do it very genially and very generously.

So those are some things I just wanted to share, as I hear the plaintive cry.

But remember what the Republicans had just proposed when the whole operation shut down. We proposed the entire unemployment extension package; you bet, and many of us voted for that. I have heard that go up.

And the only reason that those who voted against it voted against it was



because it was not paid for. And we said, "Run up the unemployment extension thing again and pay for it and you will have an unanimous vote out of us."

But even without that, 10 Republicans supported the unemployment extension even if it was not paid for. So I hope we can lay that one to rest—and we will, because that is a fundamental difference.

You heard our Republican leader state it, and you heard the majority leader state it. There is a fundamental difference. Ours comes from a more painful exercise. Ours comes from the fact that on November 3 we lost, and we lost on the basis of no new taxes and cut spending. And we have seen that completely subverted in these last days—completely turned on its head. And not only with what is coming in the form of energy taxes.

Forget the rich. You could confiscate everything they have, all of it, take it away and just forget taxing them, take it, take every yacht, every villa, every ranch, every stock certificate, and that will run the country for 6 months. That is only \$750 billion. And that is the Walton family, and that is Warren Buffett, and that is every little thing you can get your hands on. You pick the list: Fortune 500, Barron's, Forbes—take it all, run the country for 6 months because it is only about—only?—\$750 billion at the most and I am being quite genial. I think all of the Wal-Mart family is probably \$5.2 billion.

So we have to go through these class warfare discussions in here—the poor, wretched people of the country. Let me tell you, this is a pretty significant country. If I had my way, everybody in the country ought to put \$5 into the kitty every year, regardless of their net worth or their income, just to let people know that for the price of a movie ticket or two packs of cigarettes they are in the game. That would raise a few bucks: \$5, from every American citizen regardless of where they are in the system.

Oh, we would hear the debate, "I could not afford \$5." For Lord's sake, within the support systems we have established for them? And the irony that in this budget is an increase in food stamps because we know that people will go out of work by the policies of the President—boy, that is covering every base. I mean, they really are a sharp bunch there. They are getting it together swiftly.

But, in the course of it, if this whole thing is about jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, then we will be watching closely to see what we do with Superfund, which if we do not correct will just put millions of people out of work because of joint and several liability. It does not work.

What are we going to do with the defense people that are out of work? What are we going to do with the peo-

ple who build ships? What are we going to do with the luxury tax? We have done all this. I have been in it, the Senator from Maryland has been in it, the Senator from West Virginia has been in it.

Let us just remember what the last offer was before the blame-placing started. It is a wonderful place to work. It matters not what you do as long as you learn how to place the blame.

So, before the "rascals," evil Republicans who did this terrible thing—which of course in my conjecture, it seems to me now that the theme will be that we defeated this and therefore, 6 months from now if not as many people are working or something has gone awry, it will be because of this singular day, April 21, that Republicans who had just offered \$6.5 billion in a package versus the Democrats \$12.9 billion, suddenly brought down the Earth. While the deficit is \$310 billion, and the debt which we just raised is \$4.370 trillion, and somehow this will be the divining, defining time in our country.

Nobody is going to believe that. That just is a laugh.

So, as I say, let us remember what we proposed. We said we will do the unemployment extension. We voted for it. Ten of us voted for it even if we did not pay for it. The rest of us said we will vote for it if you do pay for it and there that vote is. You can look at the roll-call.

We then said: We'll provide \$1 billion for highways. This is the Republican proposal, hear this. And do not forget what is out there. We did a highway bill of \$156 billion just a few months ago, literally, which is to be expended over 6 years: \$156 billion.

Anyway, we proposed another billion. We proposed a summer jobs program of \$1 billion. This was in our last package, our last offer—do not miss his—\$1 billion in summer jobs which we do not think are truly going to do what they should do. Temporary jobs do not prove to be permanent.

We also proposed \$300 million for immunization. And remember that there is still money stuck in the pipeline on immunization. One of the reasons that immunization does not work does not have anything to do with money, it has to do with education and mothers and fathers in the inner city, or in rural areas, who say, "I do not want to have a needle stuck in my child. What is the purpose of it?" Because it is not like when I was a young boy, where polio and measles and diphtheria were a plague on the youth of the Nation. It is not like that at all.

They have heard about needles. "Needles carry infection, they carry viruses, they are utilized by those who use controlled substances." That is where our problem is with immunization. People are uneducated.

I have seen mothers with college edu-

cations say I am not going to have my child immunized in a public health place by a bunch of people who are just rolling up their sleeves and changing—they are not going to do that. So they go to their own physician. And then they will do it.

Those are real things.

Anyway, hard-hearted as we are, we did stick in \$300 million for that, which is exactly what the Democrats proposed. We did put in natural resources funds: \$150 million—that is in there. That is our proposal.

We did put in \$100 million for the SBA, that is right here. Right there. Right there.

And do not forget how this thing was crafted. It was crafted so everybody in every State could have a little something and people would call us and say "Oh, Senator, surely you are not going to vote against that package"—whatever they called it, the stimulant package or the "simulous" package or symbolism package—"you are going to vote for that, are you not, because we are going to get some highway money and we are going to get the jogging path or we are going to get the trail fixed in the Shoshone Forest, that one that is near the place where you live."

How odd that would be repaired after all these years, too.

So before we all prostrate, and maybe hear again about motor-voter registration. That probably was a silly thing for us Republicans to do because we just did not think that registering people from the back of a beer truck on Saturday would be the thing to do so we did kind of resist. And we will probably do some of those again.

But in the course of it we are going to try to make this country work. And this singular vote—however it is portrayed—is truly, as our leader said, just a tiny bump in the road. We will be right here, thank you, with a lot of supportive things for President Bill Clinton because he is our President. He is my President. And he is going to be our President, God willing, for 3 years and how many weeks? Forty, thirty. That is the way it is. I am very pleased and honored to come down and visit with him in the White House.

I think the lesson learned here is this is not the House of Representatives where over there they have learned how to deal with an abused minority where you just line them up like 10 pins and fire the ball and just spread them. That is not this place. You do not do that here.

So if there is a lesson to be learned, it is: Mr. President, include us in what you wish, but if you do not wish to, just tell us. But do not lure us and say I want your help, I want your participation and then not do it. Better just say no. But if you are going to, tell us honestly and truly what you want and we will tell you honestly and truly what we think we can do.

He has been through a rocky time with his foreign policy, not including

the Republicans. He made that apology to Representative HENRY HYDE. He has come to us. These things are not said by a man who is feeling aggrieved or pouting, but it is said by a person—just do it. If you are going to do it, do it, but do not tell us one thing and do another or else the Presidency or this administration will be in peril. What is now disappointment will in a year turn to what is called betrayal, and that cannot be good for the country.

So I say just watch what we do. We are not here to obstruct. We have not obstructed, neither in this debate nor in the RECORD of the Senate since we started. There will be a lot more of us supporting this President on certain issues. We are here; we are ready to work. It is a bipartisan Government. It is a two-party Government. That is what makes us unique.

I hope the orgy of blame placing about the significance of this day will stop. In the course of human events is not but a flutter of a hummingbird wing near a honeysuckle.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, the hour is late and I am not going to take time to respond to many of the things that the assistant Republican leader had to say, although I disagree very strongly with a lot of them. I just want to address three points.

Early on in his statement he said: Who is fooling whom? Who is fooling whom? He cited a couple of things, and I want to make it very clear who is fooling whom. He said, first of all, "The Republicans have not been doing a filibuster because the Democrats have spoken for more hours than we have spoken in the course of considering this bill."

I say to the distinguished assistant Republican leader, that is really irrelevant. The Republicans sent a letter saying they were not going to vote to invoke cloture on this measure. So what we were facing was filibuster by letter, and, therefore, the debate time, in a sense, was irrelevant.

The majority leader repeatedly asked for an agreement on what amendments would be considered, and on when we could go to a final vote on the measure. We never got it. We had this letter that says, "Therefore, we will not vote to invoke cloture on this measure as presently constituted, notwithstanding the scheduled Easter recess," signed by every one of the Republican Members of the Senate. The filibuster is stated right there in their letter.

So who is fooling whom? We get this hour count which is irrelevant. It may be my distinguished friend can say in half the time that those of us on our side can say the points he wants to make. None of it matters as long as you took this position and held to it, which the Republicans did consistently

through 12 days. So who is fooling whom?

Then he says there have been 102 measures passed since the 103d Congress convened and that shows that there is no gridlock taking place here. Now who is fooling whom? Of the 102 measures, the vast majority of them were resolutions. Most of them were simple Senate resolutions appointing a legal counsel, expressing our sympathies on the death of the Governor of South Dakota, congratulating the winner of the NCAA tournament, notifying the President that we were here and ready to do business, proclaiming "Organ Tissue Donor Week" and similar measures on down the line.

We have had four major pieces of legislation in this Congress so far. We have had family and medical leave, motor-voter, the budget resolution, and the jobs bill. The Republican minority filibustered two of them: the motor-voter bill and the jobs bill. They could not filibuster the budget resolution because under the conditions under which it is considered, you have limited time and it cannot be filibustered. They decided in the end not to filibuster family and medical leave because a number of people on that side of the aisle were already on record with respect to that legislation from the last Congress.

So who is fooling whom? One hundred and two measures, have passed in the 103d Congress, most of them dealing with simple resolutions. Of the four measures of real consequence, one could not be filibustered, and two of the other three were filibustered by my Republican colleagues.

Finally, they talk about cutting spending. We had a budget resolution before us that cut spending by over \$200 billion and every one of them voted against it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, the hour is late and I do not want to protract this, but perhaps the Senator from Maryland—who I do enjoy greatly personally—and I can both agree that the ones who are really being fooled are the American public. We can stand here and say who is fooling whom. I know what the letter said. I remember signing it. But I also remember the reason for it was so that we could be heard. It is not our duty as a minority to lie under the ark of a steamroller and just watch it plaster us around the wheel. That is not the duty of the minority, and we will not have any part of it.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. That is a different point. The Senator may make that point, but do not come out and cite the

point of 26 hours of debate and 13 hours of debate when you sign this letter. The Senator is now giving the essential rationale for his position. I may not agree with it, but at least it is a different position. I may not agree with it, but at least it is a different position from citing the number of hours spent on debate and saying, who is fooling whom? The debate hours are irrelevant in the light of this letter. That is the point I am making to the Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. I guess I can say, Madam President, the word "filibuster" is being misused in this process and perhaps that is part of the fooling, especially when the letter was presented to the majority leader as part of good-faith negotiations where he was wondering where we stood. I thought that was a service to the process. We said in the letter exactly what the Senator from Maryland has expressed. I think that is pretty up front, pretty authentic, pretty real, pretty honest. I am very proud of that. The majority leader knew exactly what to do with that, and then the procedure unfolded and we still came in second place with the number of hours expended.

But you read off a list of things that we have done here. It makes me wonder, I had not realized, why would the majority leader take us through such trivial agenda?

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that? Is that a question? I will be happy to answer it.

Mr. SIMPSON. In just a moment, I will. Indeed, you bring it up to make it sound as if these are trivial things. I ask the Senator from Maryland why the leader would bring up such trivial material when we have so much to do of such import?

Mr. SARBANES. Because a lot of these matters have to be done at the beginning of a session in order to organize the Senate. It is a standard procedure to pass a resolution once we come into session notifying the President that the Senate is now in session and prepared to do business. You have a host of measures of that sort in order to get the institution underway. You appoint legal counsel, then you pass some of these commemorative resolutions which we do as a matter of course.

Now, for the Senator then to cite 102 items and say that proves there has not been any gridlock when most of the items in the broader legislative sense are really not consequential, I want to refer back to the Senator's original question: Who is fooling whom? We have had four major legislative items in this session. On one, there could not be a filibuster because the hours were limited. Two of the other three were filibustered by the Republican minority.

What we have now is filibuster by letter. That is a different technique, I have to admit. I have never seen it be-



fore in the Senate. I do not know, but I assume we will be seeing it again. But it is a new departure, and in a sense the Senator is right when he says you now have to redefine the term filibuster to encompass this kind of tactic.

But it was the Senator from Wyoming who put the question, who is fooling whom? He then cited the number of hours of debate to try to make the point, somehow, that they were not obstructing consideration of this measure when there was a letter saying we are not going to let you get to that measure. Here it is, signed in pen and ink. Now I say, who is fooling whom? The Senator from Wyoming said we have considered 102 measures in this Congress. My response was, what were those measures? My recollection was that the items we had considered included only a few major bills. There was no health care bill. There was not a Clean Water Act. There was not a major environmental measure. And I went and looked; and, needed, most of them are the simple resolution and house-keeping measures I have already mentioned.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, is this the answer to my question or the Senator's question?

Mr. SARBANES. I hope so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I just was wondering about that answer. But now it is all right. I have it understood.

Let me just say the fooling, as I say, will be of the American public who thought on November 3 that they voted for less spending and no taxes, and in a year they are going to be furious, absolutely furious. And that will not be good. That will not be good for our country. We will have duped them, and the dupe will be \$273 billion in new taxes, whether you call them energy fees or user fees or Social Security. And I am ready to do some things with Social Security.

I thought the President made a serious mistake by not means testing or putting a net worth or income limit on people on their cost-of-living allowances. We could have picked up billions of dollars. But, no, no; everybody ran for the exits on that one. We will run for the exits on part B premiums on Medicare. We will run for the exits on taking away deductibility of employers on health care. So what are we going to do? And we all know what we have to do.

I caution my friend from Maryland, it is the same thing that happened to me out of my regard and affection for my President. I ended up defending him when he asked me to defend him. Then I ended up defending him when he had not even asked me to defend him, and then you get defensive and you lose. And that could easily happen. I can see

the pain as it begins to roll through over there. And, boy, do I understand it. It stings. It hurts.

But if we deal with each other honestly and up front and say if you want our participation, we will be glad to get in the game; if you do not, let us know, at least that gives us a method.

I think was a most authentic approach to governing where instead of making the majority leader guess where we were, we put it right on the table. I think that is good.

But we are ready to work to make the country work. Let us all step up and see what we are going to do with Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and really get in there and whack, because the rest of this stuff is peanuts. If we simply means tested the cost of living allowance on Social Security, we could have passed the whole original package. That is between \$14 and \$22 billion. And it just goes to everybody, regardless of what they put in or what they have taken out, or what they owe or what they own. How absurd. There is where your bucks are within this system.

So perhaps we can quit fooling the American people because I would like to see somebody walk in here and help me do something with the Veterans Administration budget and whack it down.

Anybody ready for a little hard work? I am ready. We are the only country on Earth that gives benefits to people who have never been involved in combat, the only country on Earth. Are you ready to do some cutting on the Social Security system? Speak up. I am ready to change the retirement date; ready to do some things with the COLA. I am ready to do things with part B premiums. Anybody ready to bring them to 100 percent from 25 percent? Why is Joe Six-Pack paying 25 percent of the premium for Paul Mellon?

Step up to the plate. Comparatively, this bill is kiddie league stuff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, let me just simply say, as I listened to the assistant Republican leader say we need to deal with each other honestly. I say to him that is why I raised this point with respect to who is fooling whom. I think it is important to deal with each other honestly, and I think it is very important that we do not seek to fool one another. That is why I addressed those issues.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, Saturday, April 24 marks the 78th anniversary of one of the most tragic events in

world history—the Armenian genocide—in which more than a million Armenians perished at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. Ottoman officials took advantage of a world distracted by World War I to seek its final solution to the Armenian problem. From 1916 to 1923, they carried out a systematic campaign designed to eradicate all Armenians living in the territories of the declining Turkish Ottoman Empire. In all, over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children starved to death in detention camps, died in brutal forced marches, or were murdered outright.

At the time of the genocide 78 years ago, Europe found itself torn apart by World War I. The Ottoman Empire, which had experienced several years of rapid decline in its power and stature, had allied itself with Germany in hopes of regaining its earlier prominence. This tactic failed. Russia, on the side of the allies, soon invaded Turkey, bringing the ancient empire to its knees. Instead of looking at its own internal failings the Turks sought a scapegoat, and they found the Armenians.

On the night of April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Government rounded up and exiled hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders. The Turks eventually executed these people in remote areas of Anatolia. Soon afterward, the Turkish Government stripped the young Armenian men who served in the Turkish Army of their weapons and forced them to work in labor battalions, where most starved to death or were executed.

Having been deprived of their leaders and men of fighting age, the Armenian people had no choice but to accede to the Turkish orders that they disarm and relocate to remote locations in eastern Turkey. The majority of the banished Armenians died from starvation and disease during relentless marches forced upon them by the Turkish Government. Others were massacred. That some 500,000 refugees were able to escape north across the Russian border and south into Arab lands, with many eventually reaching Europe and the United States, was a miracle.

Tragically, those Armenians who could not escape, did not fare as well. Although they battled courageously against the Turkish Army and established an independent Armenian State in 1918—the first since the Armenian Kingdom of 1375—which was enlarged through the Treaty of Sevres between Turkey and the victorious Allies in 1920, the independence was short lived. Later that same year, both the Soviet Union and Turkey invaded and divided the small country. The Armenians who returned to Turkish control continued to be repressed and slaughtered.

Armenian-Americans and their Armenian brothers and sisters throughout the world who lost relatives and

friends recall the genocide with profound anguish and grief. Most painful to them is the continuing failure of Turkey to recognize that this genocide under the Ottoman regime ever occurred, despite the existence of considerable documentation to the contrary.

One source of this documentation is Henry Morgenthau, who was United States Ambassador to Ottoman Turkey at the time. He is hailed by Armenians around the world as having led the international outcry against the genocide. In 1918, Ambassador Morgenthau wrote:

The facts contained in the report, received at the embassy from absolutely trustworthy eyewitnesses surpass the most beastly and diabolical cruelties ever before perpetrated or imagined in the history of the world.

There are also countless personal descriptions of the horrors, written by Armenian survivors. In his memoirs of the genocide, Abraham H. Hartunian offers the following account of its daily implementation in the city of Marash:

Every day new lists were prepared, and successively the convoys were put on their way. Everyone knew that in a little while his turn would come. There was not a glimmer of hope. Indeed the bitter scenes daily enacted in the city rendered the people willing to go out and face death as soon as possible. Innocent Armenians by the dozens were hanged from scaffolds in different sections of the city, and their corpses dangling in the air wrought horror upon the people. On different days and in different places nearly five hundred Armenians were either shot or hanged.

In light of the overwhelming evidence, including that which I have just cited, the continued denial by the current Turkish Government concerning the occurrence of the Armenian genocide is intolerable and must be protested vigorously by the United States. Sadly, because of the war and the isolationist attitude in our country at the time, our Government did not more forcefully protest the actions of the Ottoman Turks while they were taking place.

We take time to recount these tragic events not just to honor the courageous Armenians who lost their lives in this senseless persecution and extermination, but to educate future generations in the hope such brutality will never recur. As subsequent events have shown, the Armenian genocide was not the last, but the first of many attempts to exterminate peoples in this century. Six million Jews perished under Hitler, untold numbers of Soviet citizens died in the gulags under Stalin, countless Cambodians under the Pol Pot regime were victims of genocide, and, today, we witness the brutality occurring in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In failing to stop the mass murders, starvation and systematic rape occurring there, the world is violating its solemn commitment to guard against the crime of genocide as enunciated in the Genocide Treaty. We are also ignoring our com-

mitment to the memory of the victims of the Armenian Genocide.

It has often been reported that when one of Hitler's aides suggested to him that world public opinion would be extremely hostile if he proceeded with his plans to exterminate the Jews, he replied, "Who remembers the Armenians?" This annual congressional commemoration of the Armenian Genocide is designed to ensure that the 1.5 million Armenians who perished are not forgotten.

The work that the Armenian Study Center at the University of Michigan in Dearborn is making a great contribution to that effort. With some 60,000 Armenian-Americans living in Michigan and approximately 30,000 living in the area of the center, Dearborn is an ideal location for this facility. By promoting objective scholarship, the Center is helping to balance the efforts of those who seek to alter history by denying the significance of the Armenian genocide.

Today, the challenges and difficulties facing Armenia, which gained its independence in 1991, are exacerbated by the brutal blockade imposed upon it by Azerbaijan over the two countries' dispute involving Nagorno-Karabakh. Thousands of Armenians have died and thousands more face death by starvation and disease. I have joined others in condemning Azeri aggression against the Armenian people, and have sent a letter to Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali urging him to do everything in his power to ensure that food and other supplies can get through the blockade and into Armenia. Unfortunately, little progress has been made. In fact, Turkish Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel recently declared that Turkey would not provide any type of aid to the Armenians and that, to ensure Turkish security, they must employ fear tactics and increased military presence against Armenia.

In light of the past sacrifices that the Armenian people have made and the tragic events that they have endured, we must make sure that this young country has the ability to survive and realize true independence.

The brave Armenian people's ability to survive and the brutal repression carried out against them throughout history stands as a monument to their endurance and will to live. Today, we honor both the victims and their relatives and descendants who have continued to keep the Armenian culture and drive for true independence alive.

Mr. President, the entire world must speak with one voice in condemning the crimes committed by the Ottoman Turks, for they were not simply crimes against the Armenians, but against all mankind. Through commemorations like this one today, the work of organizations such as the Armenian Study Center in Michigan, and the individual efforts of private citizens throughout

the world, we must work to preserve the truth of these tragedies, so that future generations might be spared the horrors of the past.

#### THE 78TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

The Armenian genocide marked a dark chapter in world history. As we commemorate the anniversary of this grave injustice in Armenian history, we must resolve never to forget the terrible suffering of the Armenian people. Today, the struggle continues for Armenian people.

Azerbaijan's blockade of Armenia, coupled with regional instability, have had a devastating impact on Armenia. In December, President Levon Ter-Petrosian of Armenia declared his country a national disaster. Industry has come to a halt and the people suffered through a long and unbearable winter. The blockade has taken its toll on the people and the nation's industrial base. Oil supplies are short. Basic supplies are lacking. The United States has helped by providing food aid. But more must be done.

The United States needs to pressure Azerbaijan until it lifts the blockade. We need to take every opportunity to support a solution to the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Mr. President, it is essential that the Armenian people have the opportunity to live in peace. I can think of no day more appropriate than this anniversary to strengthen our resolve to work toward that goal.

#### COMMEMORATING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, every year at this time we commemorate the terrible genocidal campaign of 1915, which mercilessly rooted out the vibrant Armenian communities of the Ottoman Empire, tore families apart, killed millions, and drove millions into permanent exile. This year we focus our attention as well on a more recent tragedy—the devastating winter of 1992-93. We honor the victims, and we pay tribute to the indomitable courage and determination of the Armenian people, which have enabled the new Armenian Republic to survive.

Less than 2 years ago that small republic of some 3.5 million people emerged from the graveyard of the old Soviet Union and entered a new and hopeful era of national integrity and independence. By most standards, Armenia is not rich. It is a small, landlocked nation, poor in natural resources; having suffered for 70 years the depredations of Soviet mismanagement and exploitation, it faces all the difficult, painful problems of economic



transformation that in some degree afflict all the constituent states of the former U.S.S.R.; and it has had to cope with the consequences of the devastating earthquake that barely 4 years ago killed 25,000 people and destroyed some 10 percent of the republic's industrial capacity.

With independence came a new vision. Armenia's greatest resource is its people—their spirit, their industriousness, their intelligence and imagination, their courage in the face of adversity. Armenian-Americans, and indeed Armenian communities around the globe, rose as one to help build a free, democratic, and prosperous state in the new Armenia. No one expected the future to be easy. Having lived most of this century in the shadow of the terrible tragedy of 1915, however, Armenians did not recoil from the new challenge; rather, they embraced it.

But no one could have anticipated the form this challenge would take over the winter of 1992-93. Armenia's links to the world pass through the neighboring countries of Azerbaijan and Georgia. This winter the expanding Azerbaijani blockade, compounded by unrest in Georgia, severed virtually all those links, depriving the new nation of essential stocks of food, fuel, and medicine, leaving an estimated 95 percent of the population below the poverty level and especially imperiling the society's most vulnerable members, its children and the elderly. The cutoff of fuel and electricity supplies closed the schools, shut down industry, and crippled medical services.

Mr. President, as we commemorate the tragedy of 1915, I call attention to today's crisis in Armenia. This crisis does not end with winter's end; there is little comfort to be taken in the fact that the warmer temperatures of spring leave fewer persons at risk of freezing to death. I have no doubt that the indomitable spirit of the Armenian people will prove triumphant, as it has in the past, and the nascent democratic Armenian Republic will survive the national and myriad personal tragedies of these recent months. But let us have no illusions about the magnitude and long-term implications of the present crisis. These are made clear in the following reports from U.S. observers and from the Centers for Disease Control, and I ask unanimous consent to have them included in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Letters From Armenia]

THE WORST OF DAYS

JANUARY, 1993.

DEAR MARYSIA: I'm ashamed to have you look at this because it's so poorly written. But to be honest, it's so hard to be able to work seriously on anything like a funding proposal here. There's something about living without any heat or electricity in below-zero temperatures that makes the thought of doing anything academic pretty absurd.

People here, including myself, have been reduced to the state of animals. For several days there was no water at all where I live because there was not enough electricity to pump it into the building. And even when there is water, the possibility of washing is out of the question because there is no way to heat up the water, and if you decide to wash with cold water, there's no way to warm yourself after you wash. And, of course, hot meals are out of the question, because there is no way to heat up the food.

Things have gotten a little bit better in the last few days because the weather has warmed up a bit and some of the snow has even melted.

They say that the pipeline that exploded in Georgia should be fixed by tomorrow, so we'll be back to 12 hours of electricity a day. (However, even when we theoretically have 12 hours a day, it is a quite common to go without it for many days at a time because the electric stations are so overloaded that they frequently explode. Then you have to wait for someone to come fix them before you get any electricity back.)

As you may have heard, the repair work on this exploded pipeline was slowed down because Azeri snipers were shooting at anyone who came near the pipeline. However, Russia has sent troops to guard the repair work—or so the story goes—and they tell us that things should be better soon.

It is very hard to get any concrete information here at the moment. There are no working phones. The radio and television don't work—it takes electricity to run these things. So, nobody knows exactly what is going on. I was stopped by the police last week as I was walking home at night. It turned out there was a curfew, and I wasn't supposed to be out after dark. I had no way of knowing that because none of the vehicles for conveying information were working. It's pretty spooky.

Marysia, after spending a winter here, I must say that any attitude toward people here has softened a great deal. There is just no way to imagine what it is like to be absolutely freezing month after month.

Last year, the period without gas or electricity was relatively short, so people were able to withstand it. But this year, it has lasted the whole winter. And there is no indication that things are going to be any better next year.

This year, people were able to manage by cutting down all the trees and buying kerosene. But next year there will be no more valuables left to sell and no more trees left to cut down. I really can't imagine what people will do.

There is a profound depression here. More and more people have stories about neighbors or relatives who have died because of some cold-related reason. Old people and babies who get sick are unable to recover because there is no way to get warm.

I have heard of lots of newborn babies dying of pneumonia or other illnesses. Also, the number of fire-related deaths is growing. Just a few weeks ago, a whole dormitory burned down because of a kerosene-related accident. One person died and three were critically injured. But perhaps the saddest story I have heard was told to me last week by a co-worker of mine.

He said that two children in his apartment were poisoned to death last week. The cause of their death was poisonous gas released by their television set, which imploded after an electricity surge. When the electricity goes off here, you're supposed to turn off all your appliances because sometimes it surges when

it goes back on, causing explosions. Apparently, his neighbors forgot to turn off the television. They were out of their apartment when the electricity came back on, and by the time they got back to the apartment, the two children had already been poisoned to death.

It is very heartbreaking to watch what is happening here.

REBECCA MORRIS.

NOTE.—Rebecca Morris is a University of Michigan student doing field work in 19th and 20th Century Armenian History in Yerevan. Ms. Morris, not of Armenian heritage, travelled to Armenia for the first time two years ago to study the language at the AGBU/University of Michigan Intensive Armenian Language Summer Course in Yerevan. She now speaks fluent Armenian.

[Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Feb. 5, 1993]

EMERGENCY PUBLIC HEALTH SURVEILLANCE IN RESPONSE TO FOOD AND ENERGY SHORTAGES—ARMENIA, 1992.

#### INTERNATIONAL NOTES

Living conditions in Armenia have deteriorated since 1988 as a result of an economic blockade related to a territorial conflict between Armenia and a neighboring country. The effects of this blockade—a drastic reduction in available food, heating fuel, gasoline, electricity, health services, drugs, and vaccines—have placed residents of Armenia at increased risk for morbidity and mortality from nutritional deficiencies, infectious diseases, and hypothermia. To assess and monitor the current health and nutritional status of residents of Armenia, the Armenian National Institute of Health, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and CDC have developed the Emergency Public Health Information Surveillance System (EPHISS). This report summarizes preliminary results for 1992.

Although existing data collection systems maintained by the Ministry of Health (MOH) of Armenia monitor many health indicators, these systems do not monitor nutritional status or market indicators that might serve as early warning signs of food shortages. The EPHISS was designed to retrospectively and prospectively monitor these indicators.

EPHISS staff collected anthropometric (i.e., height and weight) data from medical records for children born in July and August of 1990, 1991, and 1992 from selected pediatric clinics in the capital, Yerevan. The comparison of data from each of these years in two pilot clinics indicated that the nutritional status of infants and young children had deteriorated; the prevalence of wasting (weight-for-height <2 standard deviations below the median of CDC's National Center for Health Statistics/World Health Organization growth reference) was 5.3% during the last half of 1992, compared with less than 1% during the previous 2 years (1).

To assess food security among elderly pensioners living on a fixed income, EPHISS staff repeated a nutritional needs survey in December for comparison with results obtained in a similar survey in April 1992 (2). Among the elderly, 308 (89%) of 347 pensioners surveyed reported having insufficient money to buy food; 291 (84%), insufficient food; 279 (80%), no savings; and 71 (21%), less than 1 day's food supply at home. The survey suggested that conditions had deteriorated since the previous survey: Increases were noted in the percentage of persons who reported selling personal possessions to buy food (from 18% to 37%) and the percentage with weight loss of 5 kg or more during the

previous 6 months (from 45% to 82%) (Table 1).

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO NUTRITION ASSESSMENT AMONG THE ELDERLY—ARMENIA, APRIL AND DECEMBER 1992

Characteristic	April 1992 (n=381)		December 1992 (n=347)	
	Per-cent	(95 percent CI) <sup>1</sup>	Per-cent	(95 percent CI)
Food security:				
Insufficient money for food	76	(71.1–80.3)	89	(85.7–92.3)
Insufficient food to eat	62	(57.1–66.9)	84	(80.1–87.9)
<1 day's food supply in home	11	(7.9–14.1)	21	(18.7–25.3)
Health status:				
≥5 kg weight loss during past 6 months	45	(40.0–49.9)	62	(56.9–67.1)
Savings:				
0 SUR <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>3</sup>		80	(75.8–84.2)
<500 SUR	71	(68.4–75.5)	82	(77.9–88.0)
Coping strategies:				
Selling personal possessions to buy food	18	(14.1–21.9)	37	(31.9–42.1)
Pension income (per month):				
Mean (SUR/U.S. dollar)		340/\$3.40		1233/\$2.74
(Range (SUR))		(133–448)		(800–2775)

<sup>1</sup> Confidence interval.

<sup>2</sup> Soviet Union ruble. At the time of the April 1992 survey, the exchange rate was approximately 100 SUR=\$1 U.S.; in December 1992, approximately 450 SUR=\$1 U.S.

<sup>3</sup> Not available.

Data from the MOH were used to assess communicable disease occurrence and crude and infant mortality rates. From April through October 1992, the MOH reported that monthly incidence rates of measles had increased by 60%, diarrheal illness by 61%, viral hepatitis by 163%, and tuberculosis by 75%. During 1991, the infant mortality rate was 17.9 deaths per 1000 live births; data for 1992 are not yet available.

Data on economic and environmental indicators, including the market cost of a standard 1-month basket of food items, and other key items (e.g., cost of gasoline and ruble/dollar exchange rate), indicated an overall inflation rate of 360% from April through December 1992. In comparison, the monthly pension for the elderly increased by 250%, reflecting a loss of real purchasing power. As of December 1992, the monthly pension in Armenia was 1200 Soviet Union rubles (SUR), while the cost of a 1-month basket of food items was 23,000 SUR.

Surveillance data on the health of refugees, including nutritional markers, will be gathered in collaboration with the International Committee of Red Cross during distribution of relief supplies.

Reported by: V Davidiants, MD, Institute of Public Health and Div of Epidemiology, Armenian National Institute of Health, Yerevan, Armenia. SG Olds, MPH, US Agency for International Development, Yerevan, Armenia. Div of Field Epidemiology, Epidemiology Program Office; Div of Nutrition, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion; Div of Viral and Rickettsial Disease, National Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC.

Editorial Note: The 15 republics of the former Soviet Union are undergoing extraordinary economic and political change. The instability of the ruble, coupled with shifts to privatization of land and businesses, have imposed severe hardships on the populations of all 15 republics (3). Armenia is particularly vulnerable because of an ongoing territorial dispute that has resulted in an influx of approximately 300,000 ethnic Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan and because of the

economic blockade imposed by neighboring republics, which has effectively terminated any substantive importation of fuel and food.

As of December 1992, no fuel oil had been received in Armenia for 3 months, and the fuel supply for the power system was adequate for only 8 days. The shortage of fuel also prevents distribution of commodities and cooking. Power blackouts of 12 hours or more per day throughout the country have reduced availability of running water and, by compromising sanitation, increased the risk of certain infectious diseases (e.g., hepatitis A, enterovirus, giardiasis, and shigellosis). These conditions also may result in adverse health effects related to nutritional deficiencies, cold exposure, inadequate vaccination levels, and inadequate drinking water supplies.

The monthly EPHISS public health bulletin reports critical markers of health and nutritional status that have an impact on the health of persons residing in Armenia and the condition of refugees. The bulletin describes trends in "leading" and "intermediate" indicators of changes in economic, social, and environmental factors that anticipate the evolution of food shortages and famine. Detection and reporting of such changes can trigger early interventions aimed at ensuring adequate food supplies for the population (4). Although a surveillance system based on population-based "sanitary epidemiology" stations has existed since 1922 in republics of the former Soviet Union, reporting of data lacks timeliness (CDC, unpublished data, 1993). Because of critical deficiencies in transportation and communications networks in Armenia, selected simple data-gathering techniques have been identified to enable timely, accurate reporting. Targeting selected communicable diseases allows prioritization of scarce resources among competing health needs (e.g., vaccine-preventable diseases and provision of safe drinking water).

This collaborative surveillance effort is promoting the prompt dissemination of information of public health importance during this period of profound change in Armenia. With USAID support and CDC technical assistance, ministries of health in other republics (i.e., Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Uzbekistan) are also working to strengthen dissemination of essential public health information.

#### REFERENCES

1. CDC. Famine-affected, refugee, and displaced populations: recommendations for public health issues. MMWR 1992;41(no. RR-13): 11–13.
2. CDC. Nutritional needs surveys among the elderly—Russia and Armenia, 1992. MMWR 1992;41:809–11.
3. Chen LE, Rohde JE, Jolly R. A looming crisis: health in the Central Asian Republics. Lancet 1992;339:1465–7.
4. CDC. Famine-affected, refugee, and displaced populations: recommendations for public health issues. MMWR 1992;41(no. RR-13):4–5.

DECEMBER 1, 1992.

To: Mr. K. George Najarian, U.S.A., 8-101-617-259-9510.

From: Nancy Najarian, Yerevan, Armenia, 011-78852-56-22-74.

#### THE ARMENIAN CRISIS

A few days ago I sat down to write an essay in which I attempted to explain the sheer difficulty of surviving in the Republic of Armenia, not to mention holding a full-time job. The gist of the essay was that it is so physically exhausting to source needed commodities, deal with a complete lack of heat and hot water in minus 4 degrees Celsius conditions, and endure blackouts of a minimum of twelve hours a day, that to accomplish anything else but existing in Armenia is a superhuman feat.

Unfortunately, I feel compelled to write an essay tonight that touches on an even more serious note. That note wrings of desperation. While you will find most Armenian citizens too proud to openly declare the situation desperate, this Westerner is not afraid to be blunt and say, we in Armenia are in a crisis situation.

Winter in all its beauty and bitterness has blanketed Armenia in an icy coldness that wrings of death. Death because over one-third of Armenia (the population of the capital and largest city in Armenia) are living in subfreezing conditions without sufficient heat, hot water, gas, bread, and other foodstuffs. Babies are cold and without milk, pensioners do not have enough money to support themselves amidst the hyperinflation, and bread and butter are rationed. Just this afternoon Georgia announced yet another blockade. Add this blockade to the one that already exists from Azerbaijan, and you have a situation in which Armenia cannot receive virtually any of the basic necessities of life. Georgia's announcement means that the meager supply of gas and wheat that sporadically winds its way through civil war-torn Georgia to Armenia will stop. I wince at the thought. Sometimes you think that you have reached the point of being so cold and desperate for heat or light that you cannot conceive of conditions becoming worse. But, then you hear the news \* \* \*.

The government of Armenia has been forced to close virtually all of the schools, institutes, and universities. Even the two newly opened American universities that have been able to secure electricity sufficient to remain in operation, are being forced to drastically curtail energy consumption, and virtually shut down as of 4:00 pm each day. What hope, then, can the Armenian youth have for the future, when schools and places of higher education cannot operate? What can a child do at home all day during the most bitter months of the winter in a home that has no heat, water, and probably no light most of the day and evening? There are many teachers, including those from very comfortable western countries, that are committed to staying and teaching through the winter. They want to share with the Armenians a hope and means for a better future. But, how does one sustain hope if the youth have no means to learn and build a better life?

"How deep is the bottom of the barrel? How low can the standard of living plummet?" These questions are not academic. They are questions Armenians ask themselves every day. "Can you believe the price of gas has just jumped the equivalent of \$10 in one day, and there are only four places in the city to find it? What bad news should we expect next? How much money do I need to bring too the market, and is it even worth it to go because I cannot afford to buy anything? What shall I do with my children when I have not had electricity or water for three days, and I cannot prepare a hot meal for them or give them a bath? How can I get to work when there is no transport? Where is there to turn when everybody is in the same state, and Armenia is an island among warring or hostile neighbors, with no access to the outside world?"

There is a distinct feeling of being held hostage in this country, hostage to external conditions that are beyond the average Armenian's control. In a country that is considered industrialized, and fairly well off by Soviet standards, the horror of hunger, humiliation, and underdevelopment is setting in. All factories except those producing



bread are shut down, speculation is rampant, and humanitarian shipments of wheat and other foodstuffs are held or absconded by unfriendly neighbors.

What is the immediate solution? Peace with Azerbaijan? A completely opened border with Turkey? Peace in Georgia? These are all sticky diplomatic problems that require complex negotiations involving world powers. Much more immediate action is needed to confront the crisis in Armenia. Awareness of the situation is the first step. Appeals to federal governments is the next. Air lifts or armed escorts of food and fuel are crucial. There already may be a handful of other countries one can list, where conditions are dire. Be that as it may, three-and-a-half million people are living in subfreezing, subhuman conditions. Feel the crisis, even for a moment, and make some noise. Remember the joy we all felt in the idea of a new world order, where peace and democracy would reign? A cold, hungry, and crippled nation struggling to hold onto its democratic beginnings, is in need. Let's practice a new world sharing among this new world order. Three-and-a-half million people would be most grateful.

Armenia trip #12—October 16 through November 15, 1992, report by Carolann S. Najarian, M.D.

#### Hospitals visited:

The Republic Hospital for T.B. in Abovian.  
The Republic Hospital for T.B. in Gumayri.  
The Republic Hospital for Maternal Care, Yerevan.  
The Orthopedic and Traumatology Hospital, Yerevan.  
The Emergency Hospital, Yerevan.  
The Erebusi Hospital, Yerevan.  
The Republic Ophthalmologic Hospital, Yerevan.  
The Republic Infectious Disease Hospital, Yerevan.  
The Ambulance Emergency Service Center.  
The Physio-Therapy Hospital, Yerevan.  
The Women's and Child Health Care Center (Erebuni), Yerevan.  
The Samaritar Hospital, Gumayri (worked at the hospital).  
Soviet Army Hospital, Gumayri (patient consultation).  
The Second Children's Hospital, Gumayri.  
The Maternity Hospital, Gumayri.  
The First Children's Hospital, Gumayri.  
The Regional Medical-Surgical Hospital, Ghogassian.

In addition, meetings were held with the Minister of Health, Dr. Ara Babloyan and a number of his deputies and with the Chairman of the Board of the new National Institute of Health, Dr. Haik Nikagossian. Reports of these meetings follow.

Two visits were made to the Ministry of health warehouse. The UAF cargo plane was met as well. On behalf of the Armenian Canadian Medical Relief Association, I interviewed potential candidates for their training programs. Supplies were distributed for Artzaghk and different regional hospitals. Patients were examined for the Diocesan surgical-rehab team scheduled for Jan. 1993. In addition, I worked in Gumayri in the intensive care unit of the Samaritar Hospital where I consulted on patients and made teaching rounds with the physicians.

This report includes my observations, assessments and specific of meetings, as well as some recommendations.

#### THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS IN ARMENIA

A crisis in the health of the people of Armenia will reach an all time high this winter. The long term effects of this crisis will haunt the nation for years to come. The

leader of the USAID team from the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta observed that peoples under stress of this kind make it through the first winter, but not through the second. Armenia is now facing its fourth winter with severe shortages of fuel and electricity; it is the second winter with critical food shortages. This, combined with the cold and the profound sense of hopelessness which has taken hold of everyone with whom I spoke, will increase the morbidity and mortality of our people this winter. As one physician put it, "We are loosing the 'ahsk'—the Armenian nation."

What are the signs of this impending disaster?

Deteriorating Nutrition Status: The food crisis and stress of daily life, now into the second year for the vast majority of Armenians, is already having an effect.

1. The birth rate is dropping. (In Gumayri, there were over 4,000 births by this time last year, this year the figure is closer to 2,000. The same kind of drop was quoted in Yerevan. My own observation confirms this: last year at this time the newborn nurseries were full, now the bassinets are empty.)

2. Newborns are showing the effects of poor maternal nutritional status: lower birth weight and lower APGAR scores. (This is the score given to all newborns which reflects their viability at birth. It was developed by Dr. Virginia Apgar and is used world wide.)

3. Rising rate of premature births.

4. Rising rate of spontaneous abortions.

5. Dropping rate of the number of mothers able to breast feed. (As estimated by physicians, only about 20% of newborns can be adequately breast fed; last year the estimate was 50%.)

The lack of bread is only one part of the problem. All foods items have risen in price 20 to 30 times. Meat is not available on a daily basis. Fish is a luxury. Grains are extraordinarily expensive. One thin sheet of "lavash" is now 30R. A loaf of bread is 36R. Lines for bread start forming at 3:00 a.m. Since my return the lines have stopped because of rationing.

Although much was made of the U.S. flour shipment, it only provided enough flour for one-half the population for one day. The shortage of infant formula cannot be overstated. There were apparently several deaths.

There has been a startling reduction in the number of patients in hospitals by 50%. This is a new phenomenon this winter. Families cannot afford even to get the sick member driven to the hospital; cannot afford the food which must be brought to the hospital; and, the hospitals are cold—home is frequently warmer. Thus, people are sicker when they first seek medical care.

Several population groups are at real risk of significantly higher death rates this year from medical illness, starvation and exposure: newborns, the elderly, refugees and those in the earthquake zone still living in substandard housing. These groups will be particularly vulnerable to the infectious diseases being seen in Armenia.

#### INFECTIOUS DISEASES

Major epidemics of infectious diseases did not occur after the earthquake. We saw then how strong the people who survived the earthquake were. Similarly, many of the refugees who have been in Armenia for two to three years survived the hardships of substandard living conditions. However there is a point at which that strength begins to break down; the food shortages we are seeing now are just what it will take to devastate

this already weakened population. The rise in infectious diseases started toward the end of 1990 and are now a serious public health problem.

In addition to viral respiratory and gastrointestinal illnesses, the most serious infectious diseases are: Hepatitis A and B, followed by brucellosis, yersinia and salmonella. Botulism is a major problem in this country where many people are canning with less than optimal heat. (Last year we were able to send anti-toxin, but this year we have been unable to obtain it from the manufacturer: 40 doses were valued at \$20,000.) All of these diseases present in their most severe forms. For example, salmonella meningitis is not uncommon.

In the past year there have been a number of outbreaks of dysentery due to contamination of the water supply by sewerage. We can expect numerous such outbreaks as municipal services deteriorate.

#### INCREASE IN TB

Another major infectious disease—tuberculosis—is surfacing particularly among the refugee population.

The refugee population is under the most stress with the poorest nutrition and poorest living conditions. It is not unusual for six or seven people to be living in a space six by twelve. Medicine is lacking. Patients are not willing to remain in the hospital to complete their treatment (8-12 months) and are lost to follow-up as outpatients. Doctors cannot offer the most accepted courses of therapy because the access to medication is unreliable.

The following information comes from the TB hospital in Gumayri, Dr. Irina Magurdumian, Chief Doctor.

	1985	1991
In Gumayri:		
New cases of TB	41	29
Total number of cases	375	1619
Mantoux tests <sup>2</sup>	40,000	2,800

<sup>1</sup> Number of chronic increased.

<sup>2</sup> No test material and syringes.

One can say from the above numbers that the new cases of TB are not being picked up. Dr. Magurdumian fears an explosion in the number of new cases because of the increase in chronic cases. (TB is spread by the infected person coughing directly on someone else—thus crowded living conditions contributing to the spread of the disease.)

Because the new cases are not being picked up early, patients are presenting with florid active TB. Previously, 73% of patients were cured; now the estimate is less than 60%.

Medications used: Streptomycin (not available), Ethambutol (large shipment from Argentina), Isoniazid (INH)—(intermittently available), and Rifampin (not available).

In Gumayri the TB hospital was completely destroyed by the earthquake. The hospital was relocated in a series of boxcars, encased in a metal outer protective layer to give some warmth. The hospital is dark and cold. There is little food to feed the patients.

There is a 500 bed TB hospital in Abovian about a half hour from Yerevan. There are 375 patients with active and chronic TB in the hospital including 35 children. The children are housed in a separate building. Many of the patients are from the same family. Most are refugees. The Chief Doctor estimates that, if tested, one out of every three refugees would test positive for TB. (This means that they are carrying the TB mycobacteria but are not clinically sick. Under the right conditions, however, they can develop the illness and spread it to others.)

One unfortunate mother from Artzaghk has had two children die of tuberculous meningitis with a third child now ill with TB as well. The building was damp and cold. The windows were broken; the ceiling plaster was coming down because of water leaks everywhere. In short, the building should be condemned. The adult unit was a bit more habitable, but not much. It had surgical units and specialty wards: chest, urologic, gynecologic, orthopedic.

Despite the terrible conditions, the hospital provides 3 hot meals daily for the patients. The food being used now is from the gulf war! An Armenian freedom fighter supervises the food distribution. He was told that he goes off to war for a few weeks and then comes back and does this job. Everything used in his absence is accounted for. I inspected this storage area as well as their relief supplies received from the Health Ministry. They had intravenous solutions and assorted medical supplies.

#### OTHER ILLNESSES

There has been a steady rise in: young insulin dependent diabetics, hemorrhagic ulcer disease not responsive, hemorrhagic stroke, heart attacks, hypertension, suicide (up 15-20%), and alcoholism and complications of drinking ethyl ETOH.

Armenia needs fuel, food and medicine in that order. Everything else, though important, is secondary.

#### HOLOCAUST/ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this is a week for memories—for recollection of events a half century and more ago. It is a week for the remembrance of horror and heroism, for the remembrance of the worst and the best that human beings can produce.

At the beginning of the week, we recalled the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. We looked to the example of a few outnumbered heroes who made their stand for freedom against the much larger forces of a government determined to see their extermination.

Yesterday, we began the days of remembrance with a national civic commemoration in the rotunda in honor of those heroes. The ceremony, which the distinguished majority leader and I were privileged to attend, began a series of several events during this week which lead up to the opening of the Holocaust Museum tomorrow morning.

Certainly, Mr. President, the Holocaust is the most tragic and appalling crime ever committed by a government against its own innocent citizens and the citizens of neighboring countries. With that in mind, it was most disturbing to read in yesterday's New York Times that a survey sponsored by the American Jewish Committee revealed that 1 in 5 adults and high school students in the United States believes it is possible that the Holocaust never happened.

With all that has been done, with the eyewitness accounts of the liberators in Europe, with the living memory of those who survived the death camps, many still somehow believe that it never took place. Perhaps the museum will correct this serious problem.

And on April 24, Mr. President, we mark the observance of another horrible event which many deny or many may believe never took place. That is the day we remember 1½ million Armenians who perished as a result of the brutal policies of the Ottoman Empire.

Today I wish to join the Armenian-American community in echoing the past statements of Presidents Carter and Reagan and Bush and to join my colleagues in the Senate in an expression of profound sadness at the recollection of the deaths of so many innocent people from 1915 to 1923.

Perhaps, Mr. President, the security and freedom we enjoy in this great country has made us indifferent, unemotional, lacking a sense of determination to deal with crimes on so large a scale. I recall it was well over 30 years after the Genocide Convention was drafted that it finally was approved here in the Senate while I was majority leader.

Mr. President, Elie Wiesel, the founding chairman of the Holocaust Memorial Council and one of the world's great spokesmen for human rights once said: "Before planning the final solution, Hitler asked, 'Who remembers the Armenians?' 'He was right,' said Elie Wiesel. 'No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews. Rejected by everyone, they felt expelled from history.'"

Mr. President, innocent men, women, and children are dying today in Bosnia. The human evil that murdered Jews and Armenians and Cambodians lives on. We must not stand by and invent excuses for inaction. We are the world's superpower. We must act. We must persuade others to act. We must remember what has happened before. We must acknowledge what is happening now. And we must say with conviction "Never Again."

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Edwin R. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Sec-

retary of the Senate on April 20, 1993, received a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

The nominations received on April 20, 1993, are shown in today's RECORD at the end of the Senate proceedings.

#### GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 16

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to promote a long-term direction for the improvement of education and lifelong learning and to provide a framework and resources to help States and others interested in education strengthen, accelerate, and sustain their own improvement efforts; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

This legislation strives to support States, local communities, schools, business and industry, and labor in reinventing our education system so that all Americans can reach internationally competitive standards, and our Nation can reach the national education goals. Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

Education is and always has been primarily a State responsibility. States have always been the "laboratories of democracy." This has been especially true in education over the past decades. The lessons we have learned from the collective work of States, local education agencies, and individual schools are incorporated in Goals 2000 and provide the basis for a new partnership between the Federal Government, States, parents, business, labor, schools, communities, and students. This new partnership is not one of mandates, but of cooperation and leadership.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act is designed to promote a long-term direction for the improvement of education and lifelong learning and to provide a framework and resources to help States and others interested in education strengthen, accelerate, and sustain their own improvement efforts. Goals 2000 will:

- Set into law the six national education goals and establish a bipartisan national education goals panel to report on progress toward achieving the goals;
- Develop voluntary academic standards and assessments that are meaningful, challenging, and appropriate for all students through the National Education Standards and Improvement Council;



- Identify the conditions of learning and teaching necessary to ensure that all students have the opportunity to meet high standards;
- Establish a national skill standards board to promote the development and adoption of occupational standards to ensure that American workers are among the best trained in the world;
- Help States and local communities involve public officials, teachers, parents, students, and business leaders in designing and reforming schools; and
- Increase flexibility for States and school districts by waiving regulations and other requirements that might impede reforms.

Though voluntary, the pursuit of these goals must be the work of our Nation as a whole. Ten years ago this month, *A Nation At Risk* was released. Its warnings still ring true. It is time to act boldly. It is time to rekindle the dream that good schools offer.

I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

*The White House, April 21, 1993.*

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes.

S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

At 7:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution to designate the weeks of April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through 17, 1994, as "Jewish Heritage Week."

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 63. An Act to establish the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill, previously received from the House of Representatives for concurrence, was read, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 63. An Act to establish the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 7:56 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 326. An Act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes.

S. 328. An Act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-746. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continued blocking of Panamanian government assets; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-62. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 16

"Whereas, farmers across the state are facing financial disaster due to the recent freezing weather that has crossed the state; and

"Whereas, financial disaster for farmers and a farming slowdown damages the state's economy in that farmers who have lost all or a portion of their crop, whether strawberries, blueberries, peaches, oranges, tomatoes, or otherwise, have reduced or no funds to cover the cost of farming but more importantly, the funds necessary to provide for the essentials of their families; which produces a devastating effect on the economics of their agriculture-based parishes as well as the state, as a whole; and

"Whereas, losses incurred by farmers due to the recent severe weather make it improbable, even impossible, for some of them to pay their expenses and meet credit obligations; and

"Whereas, the recent farming disaster is widespread and severe enough to warrant, even demand, federal assistance.

"Therefore, be it resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States, the secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and the secretary of the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry to take necessary steps to provide sufficient disaster relief to Louisiana farmers for losses due to recent severe freezing weather.

"Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation, the secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and the

secretary of the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry."

POM-63. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### "JOINT RESOLUTION

"We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled in the First Regular Session, most respectfully present and petition the President and the Congress of the United States, as follows:

"Whereas, the State of Maine has previously enacted legislation, commonly referred to as the Maine Endangered Species Act, aimed at protecting and promoting the recovery of threatened and endangered species, in part through evaluation of activities that affect habitat essential to those species; and

"Whereas, that legislation has made possible significant progress in restoration of the bald eagle population and that of other endangered species, and the continued success of these critical conservation efforts in states across the nation depends on federal support under the federal Endangered Species Act; and

"Whereas, Congress is considering legislation this year to reauthorize the federal Endangered Species Act; and

"Whereas, biodiversity, the fundamental objective of federal and state endangered species laws, ensures preservation and sustainable use of ecosystems upon which the well-being and natural heritage of the people of our State and of all Americans depend; and

"Whereas, experience at both federal and state levels has shown that this vital conservation effort has not significantly impeded economic growth, as only one project reviewed under Maine's endangered species habitat protection laws and 18 of 17,650 projects under federal endangered species review from 1987 to 1991 have been prevented due to endangered species concerns; and

"Whereas, state and federal endangered species laws involve economic and social considerations beyond the biological question of whether a species should be listed; and

"Whereas, despite concerted state and federal efforts, dozens of species across the nation are at increased risk of extinction due to delays in the federal listing process, inadequate funding for states, stalled efforts to designate habitats necessary for the recovery of species and inadequate enforcement; now therefore, be it

"Resolved: That, We, your Memorialists, take this occasion to urge the Congress of the United States to reauthorize the federal Endangered Species Act with provisions to streamline the bureaucratic process for listing threatened and endangered species, to improve critical habitat designation and enhance recovery planning efforts, to ensure adequate funding for vital conservation activities at all levels, to strengthen enforcement provisions and to broaden the scope of the Act to prevent further degradation of biodiversity; and be it further

"Resolved: That suitable copies of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable William Clinton, President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation."

POM-64. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance.

"SENATE MEMORIAL 22

"Whereas, each year the President must waive restrictions on extending "Most Favored Nation" trading status to Countries with nonmarket economies, including the People's Republic of China; and

"Whereas, each year, the United States Congress carefully reviews the President's recommendations regarding the Preferential International Trade Status of "Most Favored Nation" for a select group of American Trading Partners, including the Nation of China; and

"Whereas, in recent years the United States Congress has received substantial testimony at its annual Trade Status Renewal Hearings about flagrant and ongoing human rights violations both within China and in Chinese-Occupied Tibet; and

"Whereas, in recent years the United States Congress has passed Legislation placing conditions on the extension of "Most Favored Nation" trading status to China, including conditions on an improvement in the human rights conditions in China and Tibet; and

"Whereas, these human rights violations by China include civil political repression and forced labor camps producing products for foreign trade, as well as over forty years of illegal occupation of the independent Nation of Tibet and the widespread repression of Tibet's six million citizens; and

"Whereas, in addition to the Chinese destruction of six thousand Tibetan Monasteries and the killing of more than one million Tibetan Civilians since 1950, the Chinese Government has now engaged in a massive population transfer of Chinese Citizens into Tibet, effectively reducing Tibetans to Second Class Citizens in their own homeland; and

"Whereas, a population transfer from a Country to an Occupied Territory is a violation of International Law, and the United States Congress has recognized Tibet as an Illegally Occupied Country and that this current population transfer poses a great threat to the cultural identity of Tibet; and

"Whereas, engaged not only in a war against the Tibetan People, the Chinese have also waged a war against the natural environment of Tibet, systematically destroying wildlife, overgrazing the high plateau, disposing of hazardous waste improperly and polluting water resources vital to Tibet and much of Lower Asia;

"Now, therefore, be it further resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That it requests the President and the United States Congress to condition its approval of Most Favored Nation Trade Status with the People's Republic of China by placing human rights provisions on China's Trade Status, including specific provisions mandating a halt to population transfer of Chinese People into Tibet; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Senate urge the President to support the nonviolent struggle of the Tibetan People, led by His Holiness the Dalai Lama, 1989 Nobel laureate, and help the Tibetan People in their struggle to achieve self-determination; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Senate request the President to bring up the issue of Tibet in all discussions with the People's Republic of China; and

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this Memorial be transmitted to the New Mexico Congressional Delegation, to United States Congressman Tom Foley, to United States

Senator George Mitchell and to President Bill Clinton."

POM-65. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

"JOINT RESOLUTION

"We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled in the First Regular Session, most respectfully present and petition the President and the Congress of the United States, as follows:

"Whereas, the Federal Government has mandated new programs and transferred the responsibility of funding these programs to the several states and their political subdivisions; and

"Whereas, the Federal Government has also reduced or eliminated funding for certain programs administered at the state or local government level; and

"Whereas, the several states and their political subdivisions, as a result of economic recession and the substantial costs of these programs are experiencing severe revenue shortfalls and budget imbalances that are further exacerbated by having to fund these unfunded federal mandates; and

"Whereas, the several states, unlike the Federal Government, are required by their constitutions to balance their budgets, which further reduces their ability to absorb unfunded federal mandates; and

"Whereas, the State of Maine, recognizing the inequity of passing unfunded mandates on to its political subdivisions amended its Constitution in November of 1992 to prohibit state legislation or state administrative rules that require additional local government expenditures unless the Maine State Legislature funds those mandates; and

"Whereas, the federal practice of deferring program costs to the states is inherently unfair because many states, such as Maine, lack the resources to fund these programs; and

"Whereas, relief from unfunded mandates is most especially needed in the federal laws and rules governing benefits and utilization for Medicaid recipients, benefit levels for other entitlements and environmental regulation so that the several states and their political subdivisions can regain greater authority over their respective budgets and increase their ability to create jobs; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully recommend and urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that provides waivers to unfunded federal mandates, be they wholly or partially unfunded; and be it further

"Resolved, That this legislation direct the various agencies of the Federal Government to streamline the process by which federal mandates will be waived; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the governor of each state the Speaker of the Lower House and the President of the Senate in each state and to each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation."

POM-66. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to a veterans' medical facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

"Whereas, because of the high incidence of federal military installations and contract-

ing industries located in the Commonwealth, over 600,000 veterans of the armed services now live in Virginia; and

"Whereas, an additional 90,000 veterans of Operation Desert Storm also live in the state; and

"Whereas, medical facilities for veterans are now located only in Salem, Hampton, and Richmond; and

"Whereas, the health of many of these veterans is declining as a result of advancing age and health problems associated with their service in the military; and

"Whereas, travel to available veterans' medical facilities is difficult and inconvenient for those who live in Northern Virginia; and

"Whereas, it is estimated that approximately 220,000 veterans live within a 50-mile radius of the proposed Northern Virginia site; and

"Whereas, construction of a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Northern Virginia has been authorized by the federal government but the project has never been started; and

"Whereas, it appears that such a clinic is urgently needed and that land is currently available and is already federally owned; and

"Whereas, a similar resolution was adopted at the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Indianapolis in 1992; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring," That the Congress of the United States be hereby memorialized to give serious consideration to the construction of a veterans' outpatient clinic in the Northern Virginia area; and, be it

"Resolved further, That the Clerk of the Senate prepare and send copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Virginia congressional delegation in order that they may be apprised of the sentiment of the Virginia General Assembly."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 800. A bill to provide for a demonstration project to improve the provision of certain benefits under the Social Security Act through a private aid program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DORGAN (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 801. A bill to authorize the conduct and development of NAEP assessments for fiscal year 1994; considered and passed.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 802. A bill to require the President to seek to obtain host nation payment of most or all of the overseas basing costs for forces of the Armed Forces of the United States in such nation, to limit the use of funds for paying overseas basing costs for United States forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 803. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on N-((4-chlorophenyl)amino)carbonyl)-2-difluorobenzamide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 804. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2,6-Dichlorobenzonitrile; to the Committee on Finance.



S. 805. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-[1-(4-Chloro-2-(trifluoromethyl)-penyl) imino]-2-propoxy-methyl]-1-H-imidazole, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DECONCINI (for himself and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution designating the week beginning February 6, 1994, as "Lincoln Legacy Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

S.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution designating the week of June 1, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 800. A bill to provide for a demonstration project to improve the provision of certain benefits under the Social Security Act through a private aid program; to the Committee on Finance.

### ANTIPOVERTY ACT OF 1993

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today I am pleased to offer legislation which will demonstrate an alternative approach to welfare. I am introducing this bill on behalf of myself, and my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD. Companion legislation is being introduced in the House by Representatives KLECZKA and BARRETT.

The alternative is called Project New Hope and has encountered considerable success over the past year in Milwaukee. This program is based on a simple premise: poor persons prefer work to welfare. By providing welfare recipients, the working poor, and the unemployed a living wage, child care and health care, Project New Hope seeks to make participants self-sufficient. It assumes that there are several reasons why the poor and near poor are underemployed. Sometimes they can't find work. Sometimes the benefits of working don't offset the costs of child care and transportation. Sometimes, working a full-time job at minimum wage is just enough to throw them off AFDC, with no access to health care for their children.

Similar legislation was sponsored last year by former Representative Jim Moody and I. With the assistance and support of the former administration, the former chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, we were able to include the proposal in the Revenue Act of 1992. Both last year's legislation and this proposal are budget neutral.

But the signal that the Federal Government would be an active partner has already had a positive effect on the project's ability to garner private sector support. Last month, the program was awarded a \$1 million challenge grant by the Helen Bader Foundation. To date, a total of \$2 billion has been

pledged from a combination of local, national, and private foundation sources to ensure the continuation of the program. In addition, the Manpower Demonstration Research Corp. has been selected to conduct a rigorous evaluation and to provide technical assistance to Project New Hope throughout this 3-year demonstration period.

Although the project itself does not provide job training, it helps individuals obtain job training if they need it. People who volunteer for the program are offered a job and a wage subsidy if their income is below the poverty line. They are also offered child care and health insurance. Participants are required to conduct an 8-week private sector job search, with the help of the New Hope project. If all else fails, they will be guaranteed a public service job.

The program has broad-based support in Milwaukee. Businesses, labor, education, religious, and governmental leaders have all joined to make this alternative to welfare work.

Mr. President, as you know, over the years the need for welfare has increased dramatically. To address this problem, we need to break down structural barriers and focus on promoting economic self-sufficiency. Project New Hope is an innovative new program that shows considerable promise as an alternative welfare program. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, along with a summary of the program be inserted in the RECORD with these remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 800

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. NEW HOPE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall provide for a demonstration project for a qualified program to be conducted in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in accordance with this section.

#### (b) PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each calendar quarter in which there is a qualified program approved under this section, the Secretary shall pay to the operator of the qualified program an amount equal to the aggregate amount that would otherwise have been payable to the State in the absence of the program, with respect to participants in the program, for cash assistance and child care under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, for medical assistance under title XIX of such Act, and for administrative expenses related to such assistance for such calendar quarter. In calculating the amount of such payment, the expenses of the program incurred in evaluating the effects of the program (as required under subsection (d)(1)) may be treated as amounts necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program for purposes of part A of title IV of the Social Security Act and title XIX of such Act.

(2) LIMITATION OF PAYMENTS.—Payments shall be made under paragraph (1) to participants in the program for no more than 20 calendar quarters.

(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this section, the term "qualified program" means a program operated—

(1) by The New Hope Project, Inc., a private, not-for-profit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Wisconsin (referred to in this section as the "operator"), which offers low-income residents of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, employment, wage supplements, child care, health care, and counseling and training for job retention or advancement; and

(2) in accordance with an application submitted by the operator of the program and approved by the Secretary based on the Secretary's determination that the application satisfies the requirements of subsection (d).

(d) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—The operator of the qualified program shall provide, in the operator's application to conduct a demonstration project for the program, that the following terms and conditions will be met:

(1) The operator will develop and implement an evaluation plan designed to provide reliable information on the impact and implementation of the program. The evaluation plan will include adequately sized groups of project participants and control groups assigned at random.

(2) The operator will develop and implement a plan addressing the services and assistance to be provided by the program, the timing and determination of payments from the Secretary to the operator of the program, and the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary and the operator with respect to meeting the requirements of this paragraph.

(3) The operator will specify a methodology for determining expenditures to be paid to the operator by the Secretary, with assistance from the Secretary in calculating the amount that would otherwise have been payable to the State in the absence of the program, pursuant to subsection (b).

(4) The operator will issue an interim and final report on the results of the evaluation described in paragraph (1) to the Secretary at such times as required by the Secretary.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New Hope Project is a three year demonstration project that will assess the effect of subsidizing work for individuals and families who are currently poor. The Project offers participants help in finding a job, a community service job if they are unable to find a job after 8 weeks, wage subsidies that assure an income above the poverty level, health insurance, and child care. Participants may need one or two of these benefits, or all of them. The offer is designed to be flexible and adaptive to the individual circumstances.

The New Hope Project is a nationally recognized demonstration project sponsored by a unique consortium of community, government, business, labor, religious, and social service organizations and representatives. As a model program, The New Hope Project will work with six hundred families and individuals who choose to participate in the program and who live in two targeted inner urban areas in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The program has four key components:

The guaranteed access to a job: through non-subsidized private or non-profit employment, or if the participant cannot find a job after an eight week job search, a community service assignment will be provided.

A wage supplement: the combination of the federal and state Earned Income Credits and direct additional supplements paid by New Hope. This combination is calculated to raise a person's gross income above the poverty line.

Health insurance: equivalent in benefits to Medicaid, for families and individuals not covered by Medicaid or employer insurance. The Project has a consortium of five Health Maintenance Organization (HMO's) that participants can choose from if their employer's insurance is unacceptable.

Child care: in a home licensed or community facility. New Hope has developed a sliding fee scale to help participants pay for quality child care.

Project members will work with each participant for three years; the fourth year will be spent analyzing and evaluating the effectiveness and cost-benefits of the program.

There are three ways in which the New Hope Project is unique:

1. **Guaranteed access to a job:** if the participant has not obtained a job within the first eight weeks of job search, New Hope will offer him/her a community service assignment, up to six months at a time. These are jobs that are meant to fill the gap until the participant is able to find private sector employment, which is the overall focus of New Hope. Project staff urge participants to view the community service assignments as jobs of the last resort.

2. **Eligibility:** the Project uses income level and the willingness and desire to work as the primary eligibility criteria. The participant's household income must be at or below 150% of poverty to enter. Participation is not limited to those currently, or recently on AFDC.

3. **Means-Tested:** participants are eligible for subsidies for health insurance and child care until their income reaches 200% of poverty. Their payments for benefits increase as their income increases. Wage supplements are generally phased out at approximately 150% of poverty.

Presently, the New Hope Project has begun a 50 person pilot program, designed to be a test-model of the original 600 person program. The pilot will run for a period of approximately 8 months and will precede the start of the original 600 person program. The goal of the New Hope Project is to document the effect of this offer and then translate the successes into policies at the state and federal level. It will work with 650 families when the Project is fully operating.

These first 50 participants were recruited in March and April of this year, and the first Participant Agreements were signed in May 1992. It is in this first phase that the New Hope Project is developing the actual operating procedures that will be used in the full pilot phase that will be evaluated for potential policy changes.

As of this date, the evaluator has not been chosen. That will take place over the summer of 1992 with the consultation of local and national advisory board members.

Again, the Project's ultimate goal is to allow state and national policy makers to focus attention on alleviating the harsh circumstances of poverty through programs which are more humane, cost-effective and self-motivating than current programs which focus on welfare subsidy system.

Finally, it is the fundamental belief of The New Hope Project that all American citizens

should have access to an employment opportunity which grants a sense of self-worth and provides a sustainable level of economic certainty.

#### AN ANTI-POVERTY ALTERNATIVE: THE NEW HOPE PROJECT

##### Introduction

While there is a national consensus that the current welfare policy in the United States is an institutionalized disaster, critics differ as to causes and solutions. Some contend that recipients manipulate the system for their own personal gain and lack the motivation to be responsible contributors to the economy; others characterize the system as insensitive to the consequences of poverty in which recipients lack access to resources which would promote self-sufficiency. Solutions to the "welfare disaster" have thus far been directed toward "patching" the existing flawed system rather than conceptually reforming how a system could address the needs of those in poverty.

Welfare programs, as they currently exist, foster dependency and hopelessness. Welfare, by design, is a maintenance program, not a program to encourage people to integrate productively into the economic community, and yet this has been the expectation for recipients.

For those who are on welfare, the system keeps people below the poverty level while maintaining major disincentives to leave welfare and move into the work force. Timelines aside, recipients know that they jeopardize health and child care benefits if they move off the system and into jobs which typically do not offer these same benefits.

In this way, the structure of the welfare system discourages the work ethic and family unity; it encourages abuse and manipulation; it has not responded adequately to the changing nature of the family unit. The welfare system advances no vision, much less a strategy, for the development of stable neighborhoods and responsive institution—both of which are critical in restoring community economies and building community resources within the inner city.

Numerous welfare reform measures have been proposed and implemented by governments. Some reforms are purposefully punitive in nature, and foster cynicism and embitterment in recipients. Other reforms concentrate on extending benefits for a set period of time, or mandating work searches, or job training and education.

While perhaps well-intended, these strategies when used as welfare reforms are programmatically fragmented and incomplete. They fail to integrate welfare with a jobs creation program and benefit retention program, and therefore lack the cohesion of a well-developed holistic approach to anti-poverty.

Meanwhile, for those who work at low-wage jobs, there is the harsh reality of working full-time and year-round, and still being poor. As our economy continues to adjust to its new base, few, if any, of these low-end jobs offer employee benefits. Federal and state governments remain deadlocked over what to do about health care for the uninsured, or whether child care is a viable benefit which should be offered through social welfare agencies. The Earned Income Credit, which supplements wages of low-wage workers with dependents, is still not enough to lift a minimum-wage worker's family above the poverty level.

Individuals and families living on the edge of survival fill this nation's city cores. Al-

most 14% of American people live in poverty with women and children leading the list. And, contrary to a common misconception, only one-third of the poor are on welfare—either Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or other forms of means-tested cash equivalents. The other two thirds, over 20 million Americans, belong to the new citizen class: the working poor.

Whether the cause of poverty is unemployment or underemployment, urban poverty manifests itself in crime, drugs, violence and despair. America's inner city families are paying these high costs of poverty.

##### New Hope initiatives

The core of a successful approach to fighting poverty is, to help people secure jobs and, having secured jobs, to help people keep them. The success of such efforts will depend on a skilled aggressive, and effective placement program. The New Hope Project will work with employment placement and social service agencies to direct project participants to these job openings.

For those thwarted by either job shortages or a lack of preparedness for conventional jobs, The New Hope Project will work with agencies to develop community service jobs, particularly within the project participant's community neighborhoods. Designed to meet the obvious infrastructure and social service needs of poor communities, these jobs would be slots assigned to nonprofit and/or community-based organizations.

Given the demonstrated gap between even a poverty level income and the wages paid by most jobs available to poor workers, The New Hope Project will offer a wage supplement. It would ensure that if individuals work full-time and year-round, their incomes would move them and their families above the poverty line.

And, finally, The New Hope Project will include subsidized child care and health insurance for all uninsured workers and their families. This important component, while expensive, is necessary. Project participants need to know that the two major disincentives for coming off and staying off welfare will be provided for.

Each component of the Project is designed with the goal of creating incentives for people to work full-time in the private sector and to develop career plans that can be achieved. For each family group who chooses to be a part of the Project, project staff will offer on-going assistance and counseling.

##### The targeted neighborhoods profiled

The two neighborhoods of the New Hope Project were chosen because they are typical areas of urban poverty within the city core. They share high levels of unemployment and welfare utilization. They differ primarily in terms of racial composition.

The North Side neighborhood is 65% African-American and 29% white, while the South Side neighborhood exhibits a more diverse mix with a majority of whites, a Hispanic population of 38%, and small populations of Hmong, Vietnamese and Native Americans.

Urban poverty is evident. Both areas have a higher percentage of female headed households than the city average (50% and 40% respectively), a larger than average family size (3.1 and 2.5 persons) and a large percentage of total population under the age of eighteen (41%).

Although the Project cannot break out these neighborhoods from the overall statistics, Milwaukee leads the nation in teenage pregnancy rates, and displays the largest income gap between white and African-Americans.



The best data the Project has on welfare utilization covers a broader area than either of the targeted two neighborhoods, but there is no reason to believe they do not reflect similar statistics. The following is from a 1988 welfare study within the zip codes.

"In the North Side neighborhood, 22% of the adult population receives food stamps, 20% is on Medical Assistance, and 17% on AFDC. In the South Side neighborhood, 18% of the adult population receive food stamps, 16% are on Medical Assistance, with 14% on AFDC.

"The South Side area had the second highest number of job applications in the metropolitan area at Wisconsin Job Service, with 3,320 applications from January to October 1990. The North Side area was fourth highest, with 3,074 applications in the same period."

#### ACCESS TO A JOB

Unemployed members of the New Hope Project will be assisted in an eight week job search. If that person is unable to secure employment in the private sector or in the government, that individual will qualify for a Community Service Job. These jobs are designed to be temporary and of limited duration. The goal of the New Hope Project is that individuals who are placed in Community Service Jobs will continue their search for full-time employment in the private sector.

#### A. Community Service Jobs:

Because the Community Service Jobs comprise a critical part of New Hope's offer to low-income people without full-time jobs, the component is described here in great detail.

The Community Service Jobs are designed to meet the needs of three distinct groups of disadvantaged job-seekers:

Job-seekers whose custodial responsibilities for children or elderly people prevent them from holding most jobs.

Job-seekers who personal or work histories prevent them from being hired.

Job-seekers with severe limitations, whom no employer will hire because of physical, mental, emotional or communication problems.

In addition, Community Service Jobs must provide start-up or interim work for employees who lose work through no fault of their own but rather because of labor market limitations and fluctuations. Project offerings are triggered by participants' successful and continued working at 32 hours a week. Because many jobs at the low end of the labor market fluctuate in hours per day, days per week, or continuity of production or service, participants will predictably find themselves without work for the day. In addition to offering work for people who cannot find work, Community Service Jobs will supplement non-subsidized work so that participants can maintain continuous employment.

All Community Service Jobs pay the minimum wage, with the possible exception of long-term crew work performed directly for the Milwaukee Community Service Corps. No Community Service Jobs will pay more than forty hours a week for work performed. No Community Service Jobs will displace any current worker or infringe on any collective bargaining agreement.

We anticipate many individuals will not be successful in maintaining their first job. For this reason we will allow participants to be assigned to Community Service twice. No one will be able to hold a Community Service Job more than 26 weeks at any given time. On a case by case basis, the New Hope Project staff will determine if an exception to the 2 assignment rule should be made. In

general, we would expect that exceptions would be made in very limited circumstances such as personal or family illness or a clear mismatch of skills for available job openings at any given time.

#### B. Contract with the Milwaukee Community Service Corps:

All Community Service Jobs will be managed by the Milwaukee Community Service Corps (MCSC). The MCSC was established in 1990 to complete significant improvement projects in Milwaukee that were not being addressed by government or the private market. The MCSC also provides employment and training to economically disadvantaged Milwaukee youths between 18 and 23 years old. Under contract with the Project, the MCSC has expanded its mission to include a wider range of ages, and a different set of community service projects.

#### C. Community Agency Placements:

Some Community Services Job's will be assignments in private, non-profit agencies and organizations. Placements are designed to provide continuous work at positions that are similar to those participants might perform for pay in the future.

Agencies must qualify as sites for Community Service Jobs by meeting the following criteria:

They must perform a community service as identified below or as acceptable to the MCSC.

They must commit to provide employment for a minimum period of time, as specified in a contract between the MCSC and the community agency.

They must agree to have the participant leave the placement at any time the participant can secure non-subsidized employment.

They must agree to the conditions of employment as specified below.

Community agencies must have authorized personnel sign statements that Community Service Jobs at their agencies do not displace current or prospective non-subsidized employees, and that a supervisor at the agency will provide supervisory and administrative oversight of the Project participant.

No Community Service Jobs work may be performed for religious purposes, although Community Service Jobs work may take place in religious institutions that sponsor community services such as recreation programs, child care, education, or meal programs, provided that these programs are not religious in nature.

#### Non-profit placements:

The following community agencies are authorized community agency placements, subject to review and approval by the MCSC.

Head Start Programs, Non-Profit Day Care Centers, Non-Profit Schools, Youth Recreation Programs, Neighborhood Organizations, Community Service Organizations, Meal Programs, and New Hope Project.

#### D. Crew Work:

Crew work is designed as comparatively long-term work, lasting at least three months but no more than 26 weeks, as part of ongoing MCSC community improvement projects. It will be available to a limited number of participants.

This work may be limited to participants who meet the MCSC's standard qualifications for jobs, including health standards, income guidelines, the completion of "Individual Development Plans," and age requirements (The MCSC normally accepts people only between eighteen and twenty-three years old).

Unlike most daily work and community agency placements, participants in the work crews will work under the direct supervision

of the MCSC. Crew members will be required to abide by all MCSC standards, procedures, and discipline, just as they would any employer.

#### WAGE SUPPLEMENT COMPONENT

The New Hope Project, Inc. will offer a wage supplement to those participants who are working full-time and have one or more dependent children. The New Hope wage supplement is a combination of existing federal and state Earned Income Credits and a New Hope Expanded Earned Income Tax Credit.

#### A. Federal and State Earned Income Tax Income:

The New Hope Project will help participants with dependents who are making less than \$22,000 file for the Earned Income Tax Credits that are offered by both the state and federal government. The federal credit is available on an advance payment basis or in a lump sum after you file the federal income tax return. The state credit is available only in a lump sum payment after you file the state income tax return. The New Hope Project will use its own staff and existing agencies to help participants take full advantage of these income credits.

#### B. New Hope Expanded Earned Income Credit:

In addition to the federal and state credits, the Project will offer an expanded income credit to all participants with dependents. The Project is currently working to get tax-exempt status for this wage supplement. The New Hope wage supplement is based on the federal credit and phases out at the same point, \$22,000. The goal of New Hope is that the combination of these earned income credits will boost individuals' salaries over the poverty line. The wage supplements are based on the 1992 poverty levels as submitted by the federal government and vary according to family size and salary.

The Project maintains that single parent families with one to four children will receive a combination of Earned Income Tax Credits that will raise that individual's gross income to 115% of the poverty level working full-time at the minimum wage. Two-parent families with one to three children will receive a combination of Earned Income Tax Credits that will raise income to 105% of the poverty level working full-time at the minimum wage. All households over five persons will receive a combination of Earned Income Tax Credits that will raise income to 100% of the poverty level working full-time at the minimum wage.

#### HEALTH CARE COMPONENT

For most low-wage workers, poverty is compounded by the likelihood that their employers offer no health insurance. According to an October 1990 report by the Social Development Commission, in 1986 there were 123,076 persons without health insurance in Milwaukee County, over 13% of the population. The Social Development Commission of Milwaukee estimates that this number includes 24,000-30,000 households of working poor without health coverage.

Health insurance has been arranged with a consortium of Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO's). New Hope will offer a co-payment plan for all participants who are not covered by their employers. All New Hope Participants must have some form of health insurance, whether it be a private HMO, Medicaid, Medicare, V.A., or CHAMPUS. Participants will be assigned to a specific HMO through a drawing process and will be subject to fees and co-payment for services received as would any person utilizing the HMO. The health insurance offered by New

Hope is designed to offer both individuals and families the same level of insurance available through medicaid. This level of insurance permits both families, and individuals who may become liable for the care of dependents, to make transitions from public assistance to non-subsidized work, and to sustain non-subsidized work even when they may become liable for the care of dependents.

The New Hope Project has devised a sliding co-payment scale for participants. The co-payment increases as the participant's income increases. In all cases, the health care co-payment will never exceed 30% of a participant's net income.

#### A. How it works:

Participants qualify for health insurance in four ways. AFDC, SSI and other recipients of public assistance qualify by meeting work and reporting requirements, and running out of their eligibility for Medicaid as a result of earning more than the maximum permitted income. Uninsured participants qualify after completing four consecutive weeks of qualifying work, or six weeks within a period of eight calendar weeks, whichever they achieve first. Working participants who can demonstrate at least four consecutive weeks of qualifying work in the eight weeks before entering the Project; or at least six weeks of qualifying work in the eight weeks before entering the Project, are eligible immediately. Working participants who already have health insurance are eligible for partial reimbursement of their individual costs, so that they pay no more than the standard sliding scale personal co-payments required of all participants.

#### CHILD CARE COMPONENT

For families with children, child care is just as important a consideration as health care or pay scale. Working parents, or those seeking work, need assurance that their children will be safe and well taken care of during the hours they are away. For many inner urban parents, particularly for single parents, this task proves formidable.

Social service agencies have responded to these needs, establishing data banks which detail those child care providers who are state licensed and certified. The state of Wisconsin legislated mandatory education and training for child care workers prior to certification, and a continuing education program for those interested in expanding career options. In addition, the provider must supply background and references and the facility must meet State of Wisconsin health and safety regulations.

The New Hope Project will contract with existing agencies who monitor child care providers to allow project participants access to these certified and licensed providers. Project participants will be able to detail criteria, such as location or cultural preference or special hours, with the assurance that the list of providers not only fit these needs but also address the safety, nutrition and guidance needs of their children.

Providing accessible, affordable child care for project participants removes one of the major obstacles in the employment process. The New Hope Project also sees a second opportunity within this child care component, and that is the opportunity for project participants to become employed in the private sector as child care workers or, as part of a more innovative New Hope Initiative, as a self-employed state-certified or licensed home child care provider.

Through the Guarantee of Jobs Initiative, the Project is interested both in placing people into private or not-for-profit sector jobs

and, when needed, through the Community Jobs Initiative, in creating community service jobs especially within the two targeted urban cores.

The New Hope Project will work with existing social service agencies to place interested project participants in licensed group child care centers on a paid basis if possible, and, if not, on a community service basis. The participant will be introduced to the concept of a Family Day Care Center.

To be a Family Day Care Center, the participant must enroll in a certification program. The agencies which monitor child care providers also provide the education and training necessary for this state certification and licensing. The New Hope Project would subsidize some of the costs related to this training.

#### Referral and placement

Because people on welfare receive an inadequate level of income to provide for even basic necessities, the potential of having to pay for any additional expense of child care while searching for work further pushes employment out of reach for most recipients. While there are county moneys available for the child care needs of the working poor, most existing child care welfare assistance programs (e.g., Title XX and others) are inadequate and underfunded.

When seeking a job, parents need to find quality child care in a safe caring environment, for a price which is affordable, and for the variable hours needed. This task becomes particularly burdensome on single parents and is further exacerbated when more than one child is involved. More often, the job seeker must deliver his or her child to a neighbor or a friend or a relative, who themselves may be ill-equipped to deal with the care and attention a child requires. These short-term solutions rarely offer any consistency of environment for either the children or the parents.

The New Hope Project will offer:

(a) Participants who are working in either the private sector or community service jobs, will receive assistance in purchasing licensed or certified child care services on a sliding scale determined by income. Co-payment will be structured so as not to put an individual below the poverty line and will increase as income increases.

(b) Project staff will assist participants in locating and purchasing child care services from certified or licensed providers.

(c) Participants will have access to a range of child care services including certified group day care and family day care services or other arrangements of the individual's choice.

(d) The New Hope Project will seek formal agreements with existing day care centers and planned (as of the date of this proposal) day care centers to set aside slots for project participants.

(e) The New Hope Project will seek agreements with counseling and referral agencies for child care placement.

(f) The New Hope Project will work with public institutions, such as the Milwaukee Public Schools and Milwaukee County Parks System to take advantage of existing day care supplement programs and to develop new after school programs particularly helpful for parents in the target areas.

(g) Participants who work part-time will receive child care assistance and payments prorated to the hours they work.

(h) Payments and co-payments from the Project will be made to child care providers on a direct basis, or providers will receive payments through Milwaukee County's day care Voucher Program.

(i) Co-payments on behalf of participants will phase out according to Milwaukee County's child care assistance guidelines.

#### EVALUATION

Because the ultimate goal of the New Hope Project is to transform public policy, the evaluation of this model program is of critical importance. The Project will contract with a nationally-recognized organization with a demonstrated track record of performing credible independent evaluations of employment and social service programs.

The process of evaluation will be ongoing with the project. On a pre-project basis, the contractor evaluator will approve the procedures manual as drafted by staff to assure that Project operations provide the required data, sustain a valid comparison group, and create documented records that will be credible in public discussion about Project experience, results and policy recommendations. Some questions which the Project will answer:

Did participants achieve results significantly greater than comparison group members? If so, what accounted for greater results with each population? If not, why did the extra services and costs for participants not produce greater results?

Did services for Project participants cost more than services for Project comparison group members?

Did Project members contribute significantly more in non-subsidized wages, taxes paid, and production than comparison group members?

How do Project results compare with other employment and social service programs relative to the Project's primary goals of assisting participants earn economic independence and provide support in a manner more cost-effective than the current system?

Evaluators will also be encouraged to make interim recommendations regarding the Project during the program operations as regards to the effectiveness of the program and the integrity data collection.

After the Project is completed, evaluators will state the policy implications based upon the Project's experience, both in performance and achievements. While recognizing that vastly differing conclusions can be drawn from identical data, evaluators will follow established criteria to conclude which programs could or should be implemented as public policy. Areas of interest include:

Cost-effectiveness between control group and participants;

Job preparation for sustainable employment;

Replications and innovations of the Project;

Integrative quality of Project components into existing system;

Related issues such as quality of child-rearing, health impacts, reactions of employers, general economic activity in targeted urban cores, and educational retention.

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the legislation being introduced today by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] which will provide for a demonstration project called New Hope, to improve the delivery of welfare program services under the Social Security Act. I am especially pleased that identical legislation is today being introduced by Representative GERALD KLECZKA of Milwaukee, WI, in the House of Representatives. This legislation would provide for a waiver of various Federal



statutes to enable this project to receive Federal support. No funds are authorized beyond the levels that would otherwise be available under current law.

There is a great deal of interest in promoting welfare reform and encouraging innovative programs aimed at dealing with the problems in the current system. President Clinton has promised to end welfare as we know it. He has asserted that welfare must be a second chance, not a way of life, and that if you work, you should not live in poverty. New Hope is exactly the type of innovative project that can demonstrate that these goals are attainable. This program offers the opportunity to demonstrate that we can make a positive difference in the lives of poor men, women, and children that is a lasting one.

The primary goal of New Hope is to demonstrate to leaders, policymakers and citizens that there is a better, more humane, more cost-effective way to deal with poverty and joblessness than the current welfare system. New Hope is a 3-year demonstration project that will assess the effect of subsidizing work for individuals and families who are currently poor. The project will offer a real alternative to welfare, unemployment, and underemployment to 600 individuals in 2 central city Milwaukee neighborhoods by providing: access to jobs in the private sector; community service jobs if no job can be found in the private sector; wage supplements, if necessary to bring a family's income above the poverty line; and health care and child care subsidies up to 200 percent of poverty.

The project will target people currently on welfare, people who are unemployed, but not on welfare and people working, but still poor. While the project shares the goals of economic self sufficiency with existing efforts, it goes beyond them in three ways. First, the project guarantees access to a job. Second, it removes categorizations of who the poor are, and thereby removes some of the disincentives to participate in the current system. Finally, it links subsidies to income level, rather than creating sudden death scenarios for participants when arbitrarily established time limits are reached.

Already, in the New Hope prepilot project 51 participants have been recruited. In the period May–December 1992 there has been an 86-percent increase in the proportion of those participants who are now working full time. There has been a 75-percent decrease in the proportion of participants who are unemployed. As a result, the employed participants will no longer require an AFDC grant, and 25 percent of those participants no longer require Medicaid because employers cover the cost of health insurance.

The core of a successful approach to fighting poverty is to help people se-

cure jobs, and having secured them keep them. The success of such efforts depends on skilled, aggressive, effective experimental demonstrations like New Hope to lead the Nation's poor to economic prosperity.

I had the opportunity last week to visit the New Hope Project and spend some time talking to people involved with this project. I am very enthusiastic about its potential for helping to break the cycle of poverty and providing a national model for other communities. I am very pleased to join with my colleagues from Wisconsin in lending my strong support to this measure and to the efforts of the New Hope Project.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 802. A bill to require the President to seek to obtain host nation payment of most or all of the overseas basing costs for forces of the Armed Forces of the United States in such nation, to limit the use of funds for paying overseas basing costs for U.S. forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### BURDENSARING LEGISLATION

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to shift the burden of defending Europe and the Pacific from the American taxpayer to our wealthier allies.

The bill would require the administration to secure burdensaring agreements which require most foreign countries with U.S. military installations to pay for at least 75 percent of all U.S. overseas basing costs. Countries that receive foreign assistance from the United States would be exempt.

To ensure that the defense burden will be shifted to our wealthier allies, the bill would prohibit the United States from funding more than 25 percent of the total U.S. overseas-basing costs by fiscal year 1996. In many countries, the United States currently pays more than 75 percent of those costs.

Congress has approved a budget resolution that commits us to reduce the deficit by almost \$500 billion over the next 5 years. To relieve the obligation that we are placing on our children and free our economy from the burden of massive Federal borrowing, we must make the hard choices that are necessary to exceed, if possible, the deficit reduction goals we have set.

I have suggested before that my colleagues offer specific proposals to make deficit cuts. I have already put forward several such proposals and this legislation is another such proposal.

When this legislation is fully implemented, it could save the U.S. taxpayer almost \$3 billion annually according to Congressional Budget Office estimates. That is \$3 billion that we can subtract from the deficit and put back in the hands of American taxpayers.

Mr. President, there is no reason for the U.S. Government to continue pay-

ing the lion's share of the overseas basing costs in wealthier countries.

The administration should negotiate a better deal for the American people. It could look to the agreement we have with Japan as a model. While far from perfect, the Japanese agreement is a good model for host nation agreements because it requires the Japanese to pay for the majority of overseas basing costs.

The agreement is saving the American taxpayer money. According to OMB, for example, Japan, paid 70 percent of the U.S. overseas basing costs and the United States paid the remaining 30 percent of those costs in fiscal year 1992.

In fiscal year 1993, Japan is expected to pay for 72 percent of the overseas basing costs. By 1996, Japan is supposed to pay for all of the Japanese labor and utility costs, which are part of overseas basing costs, and will pay for 75 percent of all overseas basing costs. In addition Japan does not charge the United States rent for facilities and land we use in Japan.

On the other hand, some of our wealthier NATO allies take the American taxpayers to the cleaners. In fiscal year 1992, our wealthier NATO allies were spending less than 25 percent of the overseas basing costs. The United States paid the difference. Most of these contributions consist of the value of the land and rent for facilities used by U.S. forces.

In 1992, the German Government contributed only 23 percent of the overseas basing costs of maintaining our military in that country. The Italians contributed approximately 20 percent of the overseas basing costs of our military in that country. The British Government contributed approximately 14 percent of the overseas basing costs.

The American people shouldn't have to pay for so much of the burden. Our wealthier NATO allies can and should be required to do more. They should pay for at least 75 percent of the overseas basing costs. The legislation I am introducing today would move us in that direction.

Mr. President, we're getting the short end of the stick when it comes to paying salaries of foreign nationals as well. Foreign national pay is included in overseas basing costs. Our Government pays for salaries of foreign nationals in Germany and in all host nations who work on United States bases. In fiscal year 1992, the Germans paid for only 13 percent of those salaries. They should pay more.

At the same time, in fiscal year 1992, the Japanese paid 66 percent of those salaries and are supposed to pay for 100 percent of those salaries by the end of the Japanese 1995 fiscal year. That's a pretty good deal, and our Government should try to emulate it with our other wealthier allies.

The South Koreans should pay more as well for costs associated with em-

ploying South Koreans to work at United States military facilities. According to OMB documents, in fiscal year 1992, Korea only paid for 14 percent of the salaries for its foreign nationals who work on United States bases and the United States picked up the rest of the tab. The Koreans can afford to pay more. The administration needs to be forceful in requiring them to do that.

Mr. President, this bill is straightforward: It would require the President to seek agreements with our allies to pay at least 75 percent of all costs of maintaining U.S. troops in their countries, except for the salaries of U.S. military personnel, by 1996.

To ensure that our troops will not be undermined and our national security will not be impaired by this provision, the bill would allow the President to waive this restriction if he determines and certifies to Congress that such action is essential to the national security of the United States.

This bill is long overdue. While our economy continues to stagnate, and unemployment claims continue to rise, our wealthier allies are getting a free ride at the expense of the American people. While we pour money into the defense of their nations, they pour money into their already strong and thriving economies.

Yet, we continue to finance a disproportionate share of the defense burden. In 1991, the United States spent approximately \$1,180 per capita for the defense of the world, while Germany only spent approximately \$446 per capita. And we continue to spend the highest portion of our GDP on defense. According to the most recent available statistics, the United States spent a staggering 5.9 percent of its GDP on defense, while Germany spent only 2.8 percent, and Korea spent 4.3 percent.

The United States simply cannot afford to pay any longer. Our Nation is running a nearly \$320 billion deficit, and we have a \$4 trillion national debt. Yet, in fiscal year 1992, according to the Office of Management and Budget, we spent about \$17.7 billion on overseas basing costs. Over one-third of that, \$6.1 billion, was spent in Germany. We can't continue bankrolling the defense of our allies.

The administration must pressure our allies to pick up a greater share of the defense burden. The United States cannot continue paying the lion's share of the defense burden.

Even if the goal of this legislation is met the United States will continue to pay enormous amounts of money to defend collective security interests overseas. We will still pay for 25 percent of the overseas basing costs. We will still pay for the cost of our personnel, our equipment, our operational costs, transportation costs, and ammunition. We will still spend billions defending Europe, the Pacific, and the Middle East.

Mr. President, this bill will move the Nation in the right direction, and will at long last relieve the American people of part of the defense burden which they've carried for far too long. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as one important way to reduce our Federal deficit.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 802

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Congress has previously directed the Secretary of Defense to seek to enter into multiyear burdensharing support agreements with economically strong North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies of the United States in order to obtain increased host nation contributions toward defraying the overseas basing costs for forces of the Armed Forces of the United States in that host country.

(2) In fiscal year 1992—

(A) the government of Germany contributed approximately 23 percent of the overseas basing costs for United States forces in that country;

(B) the government of Italy contributed approximately 20 percent of the overseas basing costs for United States forces in that country;

(C) the government of the United Kingdom contributed approximately 14 percent of the overseas basing costs for United States forces in that country; and

(D) the United States paid the remainder of such costs.

(3) The Japanese government will pay 75.1 of overseas basing costs according to the host nation burdensharing support agreement between the United States and Japan.

(4) In accordance with that agreement, the government of Japan contributed in fiscal year 1992 approximately 70 percent of the overseas basing costs for United States forces in that country, and the United States paid the remainder of such costs.

(5) If the economically strong NATO allies of the United States had contributed 75 percent of the overseas basing costs that were incurred for fiscal year 1992 for United States forces in the countries of such allies, the United States would have saved an estimated \$5,000,000,000 of the amount paid by the United States for overseas basing costs for that fiscal year.

(6) It is in the national interest of the United States for the United States and our economically strong allies to enter into burdensharing support agreements that provide for such allies to defray most or all of the overseas basing costs for the United States forces stationed in the allied countries.

#### SEC. 2. INCREASED BURDEN SHARING BY ALLIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFENSE COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—The President shall enter into negotiations with each foreign nation described in subsection (b)(1) to seek to conclude an agreement that provides for such nation to pay at least 75 percent of the overseas basing costs that are incurred for the stationing of members of the Armed Forces of the United

States and related civilian employees of the Department of Defense in that nation as a result of the implementation of a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement with that nation.

(b) COVERED FOREIGN NATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the foreign nations referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(A) Each member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (other than the United States).

(B) Every other foreign nation with which the United States has a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement that provides for the assignment of combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States to permanent duty ashore in that nation or the placement of combat equipment of the United States in that nation.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN FOREIGN NATIONS.—The foreign nations referred to in subsection (a) do not include any foreign nation that receives assistance or financing under—

(A) section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2673), relating to the foreign military financing program; or

(B) the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.).

#### SEC. 3. USE OF FUNDS FOR PAYING OVERSEAS BASING COSTS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Funds may not be expended to pay more than the allowable percent of the overseas basing costs that are incurred during a fiscal year referred to in subsection (b) for the stationing of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and related civilian employees of the Department of Defense in a nation referred to in section 2(a) as a result of the implementation of a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement with that nation.

(b) MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE PERCENT.—For purposes of subsection (a), the allowable percent for a fiscal year is as follows:

(1) FISCAL YEAR 1994.—For fiscal year 1994, 60 percent.

(2) FISCAL YEAR 1995.—For fiscal year 1995, 40 percent.

(3) FISCAL YEARS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1995.—For each fiscal year that begins after September 30, 1995, 25 percent.

#### SEC. 4. WAIVER AUTHORITY.

If the President determines that it is necessary to do so in the national security interest of the United States, the President may waive, with respect to a foreign nation referred to in section 2(a), the limitation in section 3. In the case of each such waiver, the President shall submit to Congress a written certification of the determination and a description of the extent of the waiver.

#### SEC. 5. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Not later than September 30, 1993, the President shall submit to the Congress a plan and schedule for concluding with foreign nations referred to in section 2(a) agreements that provide for each such nation to pay 75 percent of the overseas basing costs that are incurred for the stationing of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and related civilian employees of the Department of Defense in that nation as a result of the implementation of a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement with that nation.

#### SEC. 6. OVERSEAS BASING COSTS DEFINED.

In this Act, the term "overseas basing costs" means all costs related to the operation of installations in foreign countries at which forces of the Armed Forces of the United States are based and—



(1) includes but are not limited to—

- (A) pay for foreign nationals;
- (B) costs of utilities;
- (C) costs of local services;
- (D) costs of military construction projects;
- (E) costs of real property maintenance;
- (F) costs of environmental restoration;
- (G) leasing costs;
- (H) taxes;
- (I) user fees;
- (J) tolls; and
- (K) import duties; and.

(2) does not include the pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 803. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on N-[[4-chlorophenyl]-amino]carbonyl]-2-difluorobenzamide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### DUTY SUSPENSION ACT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing legislation to suspend temporarily the duty on diflubenzuron, which goes by the trade name Dimilin. It is produced only in Holland and is imported by Uniroyal Chemical Co., which operates a plant in Gastonia, NC.

Dimilin is an environmentally safe pesticide used primarily for the control of gypsy moths. It acts biologically on the moth larvae, which prevents it from hatching, rather than as a toxic killer.

Mr. President, when the duty suspension for Dimilin was proposed in 1989, some opposition was expressed to the bill by Sandoz Crop Protection Co. In 1990, Sandoz withdrew its opposition.

The Uniroyal Co. has prepared a thorough description of this compound. I ask unanimous consent that this analysis be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND TEMPORARILY THE DUTY ON N-[[4-CHLOROPHENYL]AMINO]CARBONYL]-2-DIFLUOROBENZAMIDE

#### I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum outlines the principal arguments for the proposed legislation supported by Uniroyal Chemical Company to suspend through December 31, 1998, the 12.9% ad valorem Customs duties on imported N-[[4-chlorophenyl]amino]carbonyl]-2-difluorobenzamide (90%) and the 9.7% ad valorem duty plus \$0.018/kg duty on N-[[4-chlorophenyl]—amino]carbonyl]-2,6-difluorobenzamide (25%) and inerts (75%) provided for under HTS subheadings 2924.29.19 and 3808.10.20, respectively. Both of these products are known by their trade name of diflubenzuron.

The proposed legislation was reviewed in depth by the Administration and the Congress during 1991-1992. It was noncontroversial and was included as part of the House-passed Miscellaneous Tariff Act, H.R. 4318, which was pending in the Senate at the end of the session.

#### II. DESCRIPTION AND USES OF DIFLUBENZURON

The chemical diflubenzuron, commonly known by its registered brand name

"Dimilin", falls under two separate HTS subheadings depending on the percentage of basic chemical composition. N-[[4-chlorophenyl]amino]carbonyl]-2-difluorobenzamide (90%) or Dimilin Tech, is the pure product with only clay and other inerts present. N-[[4-chlorophenyl]—amino]carbonyl]-2-difluorobenzamide (25%) is diluted with inerts (75%) to compose Uniroyal product Dimilin 25. Both products are registered trademarks of Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc.

Dimilin was invented by Duphar B.V. of Holland who is the sole producer and holds the U.S. registration as well. Duphar holds the patent for diflubenzuron as well. This patent expires in 2003—well after the requested duty suspension period. Uniroyal has an agreement with Duphar to import diflubenzuron for purposes of regulating pesticide growth.

The chemical is used as an insect growth regulator. While often classified or referred to as an insecticide, it is not, and as a growth regulator, has a unique mode of action. It inhibits the ability of the egg to hatch or the larvae to rupture the cuticle thereby causing the insect to die before reaching maturity.

Its primary uses include forestry (gypsy moth control), nurseries, mosquito control, cotton, soybeans and Christmas trees. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has approved Dimilin as one of three products considered "very safe" for use in the treatment of the boll weevil in cotton. As part of a good integrated pest management program, Dimilin can replace the toxic and nasty products previously used. Dimilin is not toxic to birds, bees or fish. Dr. John Moore, Assistant Administrator of the EPA is quoted in the book "Silent Spring Revisited" as follows:

"Perhaps most encouraging is the recent practice of developing a pest management plan in which chemical pesticides are only a part of a multifaceted scheme. The emergent success story of boll weevil control in cotton production throughout the Carolinas is most illustrative. Through the use of the chemical dimilin (sic), which has selective larvicidal and chitin-inhibiting properties, early season spraying with conventional chemical insecticides is not needed. Natural predators of other cotton pests that used to be destroyed by these sprayings are once again successful in keeping these pest species in natural balance."

Thirty percent of Dimilin imports are used by State gypsy moth eradication programs where sixty five percent of the products in use by the States is Dimilin.

Another important use of Dimilin is for mosquito control. The World Health Organization approved the use of Dimilin last year for mosquito control and it is being used successfully in the U.S. and many other countries of the world because of its selective mode of operation, its low mammalian toxicity, its non-persistence in soils and hydrofoils, its lack of mobility in the environment and its low biological accumulation and magnification.

#### III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

EPA has never classified diflubenzuron as a known or likely carcinogen. This has been confirmed by Paul Schroeder in Phil Hutton's office at the EPA. Phil Hutton is the EPA product manager for diflubenzuron.

Paul Schroeder told us that the EPA has tested diflubenzuron on rats and mice for a life time at 10,000 parts per million (which is equal to 1% of their diet). They found no incidents of increased tumors and no weight loss. One non-EPA study said that there

could be slight carcinogenic characteristics. EPA determined that these tests were not applied under proper conditions and therefore were inadequate, and that there was not sufficient evidence to conclude that there may be carcinogenic characteristics. EPA basically discounted this study. Schroeder said that often times environmentalist groups will use the evidence from one study without checking as to whether or not it was correctly applied or inadequate—simply because the tests concluded what they wanted to hear. Schroeder said that the EPA has no concerns that diflubenzuron is carcinogenic, and that, at present, it is listed in Category E which means that all testing has produced negative results of carcinogens.

Since the use and application of pesticidal chemicals is comprehensively regulated, EPA and other agencies continually review the properties of these materials as exhibited in particular uses. The purpose of this review is to establish standards for applications of these materials to various crops and flora, to insure that no human or animal toxicity will result. EPA has not found diflubenzuron to be a carcinogen, but since the agency is routinely reviewing the properties of these and other pesticidal products in the context of registration renewal some environmentalist groups have interpreted this as means for concern.

Federal pesticide registrations and approvals can be divided into three categories as follows:

(1) Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)—allows EPA to register pesticides after conducting a risk/benefit analysis (i.e., will the pesticide perform its function without unreasonable risk to the environment);

(2) Section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA)—authorizes FDA to establish "safe" residue levels for pesticides found on raw agricultural commodities and other applications. Raw agricultural commodities having residues in excess of prescribed levels are deemed "adulterated" and are subject to seizure and destruction; and

Section 409 of FFDCA—allows FDA to prescribe "safe" residue levels for "food additive" chemicals—i.e., pesticide residues found in food.

Section 409 of the FFDCA contains the controversial "Delaney Clause", which prohibits EPA from establishing a Section 409 food additive level for any substance "if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal."

Many pesticides and other chemicals are toxic in high concentrations; otherwise, they could not perform their functions. Some pesticide chemicals, if present in sufficient concentrations show evidence of some potentially carcinogenic effects. Read literally, the "Delaney clause" would prohibit EPA from establishing "food additive regulations" for many agricultural pesticides. Accordingly, FDA has proposed an enforcement policy which would recognize a "de minimus" exception to the "Delaney Clause", and allow EPA to establish food additive tolerance levels where (1) carcinogenic risks are negligible, or (2) carcinogenic risks are more than negligible, but EPA decides that the benefit to the food supply outweighs potential risks. In such cases, FDA will establish appropriately low "food additive" levels, to insure that the use of these pesticides in agriculture will not cause a cancer risk to humans or animals.

In implementing this policy, EPA is in the process of identifying potential cancer risks posed by pesticides which have been registered under FIFRA and approved for certain uses. Appendix C of the attached FEDERAL REGISTER notice lists the pesticidal products which EPA is routinely reviewing in the context of registration renewal. Diflufenuron is on this list for review.

EPA has divided pesticides into five kinds for purposes of assessing cancer risks: Group A (known carcinogens), Group B (probable human carcinogens), Group C (possible human carcinogens), Group D (carcinogenicity not capable of assessment), Group E (non-carcinogenic).

#### IV. MANUFACTURE AND IMPORTATION

Diflufenuron is not manufactured by any firm in the United States. Uniroyal Chemical is the only importer for purposes of regulating pesticide growth. Uniroyal imports both the Tech grade and finished product. The Tech grade is formulated into finished products at plants in Gastonia, North Carolina and Fresno, California. Another firm American Cyanamid also imports diflufenuron for purposes of animal healthcare.

While there are other products that may be considered competitive, these are insecticides with very different modes of action and are therefore not considered competitive.

There is one other competitive product on the market that is used in the U.S. mushroom market only. Under the trade name "Apex", the product is marketed by Sandoz/Zoecon. Although "Apex" is not the same chemical as diflufenuron, there was some confusion on this point when duty suspension for diflufenuron was originally considered in 1990. In 1990, a bill to suspend the duty on diflufenuron passed the House of Representatives, but did not pass the Senate because of a Sandoz/Zoecon claim that its product was directly competitive. On July 27, 1990 Sandoz Crop Protection wrote a letter to withdraw its opposition to duty suspension for diflufenuron, but the letter did not arrive in time to get the bill in the "mini-trade" miscellaneous tariff package enacted by the 101st Congress.

#### V. COST/SAVINGS

Dimilin is a high cost product with a high duty rate. It is not imported in great quantities since its use is selective although very important. In 1991, Uniroyal imported approximately \$1,889,900 total of Dimilin. The duty paid on these imports was approximately \$216,791. The savings resulting from a duty suspension on the tariff on diflufenuron could be passed on to the consumers.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

There are no U.S. manufacturers of these products. Consequently, the enactment of a temporary duty suspension will not cause injury to United States manufacturers or other United States business interests. The product is environmentally safe and is important for agriculture and society. A temporary duty suspension will have a minimal revenue impact and may help encourage its further use in other applications.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 804. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2,6-Dichlorobenzonitrile; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 805. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-(1-(4-Chloro-2-(trifluoromethyl)-penyl)imino)-2-propoxyethyl-1-H-imidazole, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### DUTY SUSPENSION LEGISLATION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today I am introducing two bills to suspend temporarily the duty imposed on dichlobenil, and trifluralin. Similar bills have already been introduced in the House.

These products are used by a fine corporate citizen in my State, Uniroyal Chemical Co., which operates a plant in Gastonia, NC.

Mr. President, the Uniroyal Co. has prepared a thorough description of each of the compounds and an analysis of their importance to our agriculture industry. I ask unanimous consent that these analyses be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE DUTY SUSPENSION ON 2,6-DICHLOROBENZONITRILE

##### I. INTRODUCTION

This background paper provides information in support of a draft bill, supported by Uniroyal Chemical Company to extend retroactively until December 31, 1998 the temporary duty suspension on 2,6-dichlorobenzonitrile and certain imported preparations containing this important anti-sprouting agent as an active ingredient. (See Attachment A)

This duty suspension, set forth in Harmonized Tariff Schedule heading 9902.30.69, expired December 31, 1992, following Congress' failure to enact a package of miscellaneous tariff amendments last year. A provision extending this noncontroversial duty suspension was included in H.R. 4318, the Miscellaneous Tariff Act of 1992, which passed the House but was never reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

##### II. DESCRIPTION AND USES OF 2,6-DICHLOROBENZONITRILE

Commonly known by the name Dichlobenil, 2,6-Dichlorobenzonitrile is an important anti-sprouting agent widely used throughout the United States in the manufacture of agricultural and horticultural weed and seed control products. As the active ingredient in these products, Dichlobenil functions as a highly selective "pre-emergent" anti-sprouting agent. Simply stated, Dichlobenil prevents the seeds of weeds and similar horticultural pests from germinating, sprouting, and harming valuable agricultural and ornamental crops.

Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc., an American corporation headquartered in Middlebury, Connecticut, imports and sells Dichlobenil under its trade name Casaron. Uniroyal imports dichlobenil in two forms: Casaron technical grade, which is composed approximately 97% Dichlobenil, with small quantities of inert ingredients, and Casaron 85W, a mixture composed of between 85-90% by weight of Dichlobenil, plus inert ingredients (primarily calcium silicate and other clays), and minute quantities of surfactants.

After importation, both grades of Casaron are compounded with other inert ingredients—again, primarily clays—and minute amounts of surfactants, in order to manufacture anti-sprouting preparations, which are sold in the form of granules and wettable powders. Popular Casaron formulations distributed to United States end-users include

Casaron 2G (2% Casaron as active ingredient) and Casaron 4G (4% Casaron as active ingredient). Growers further dilute those formulations in water and spray them on areas where seed and weed growth control is needed.

Anti-sprouting preparations made from imported Dichlobenil are used in many important agricultural and horticultural applications. For instance, Dichlobenil is without question the most selective pest control product for a wide variety of ornamental plant cultures. It prevents the growth of harmful broadleaf weeds, without injuring the valuable ornamental growth. [By contrast, ordinary pesticide chemicals might destroy or injure ornamental plantings, as well as the harmful weeds.] Dichlobenil is also widely used by United States cranberry growers to control bog weeds harmful to their crops. Dichlobenil preparations are extensively used wherever cranberry crops are raised, especially in the New England states, the Upper Midwest (particularly Wisconsin) and the Pacific Northwest.

Dichlobenil preparations are used extensively in orchards and nurseries, and around municipal and commercial grounds and buildings. Paving contractors make frequent use of Dichlobenil preparations to kill weeds under asphalt. Dichlobenil can also be used in the manufacture of aquatic herbicides, and is particularly effective in controlling weeds such as hydrilla, whose uncontrolled growth has choked many waterways in the Southeastern United States.

In short, Dichlobenil is an important chemical used in the manufacture of seed and weed control preparations which are vital to the health of important United States agricultural and horticultural crops, and to the economic well-being of United States growers.

##### III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has never classified Dichlobenil as a known or likely carcinogen. This has been confirmed by Mr. Bob Taylor of the EPA. He is the product manager for Dichlobenil.

EPA has divided herbicides into five kinds for purposes of assessing cancer risks: Group A (known carcinogens), Group B (probable human carcinogens), Group C (possible human carcinogens), Group D (carcinogenicity not capable of assessment) and Group E (non-carcinogenic). Dichlobenil is listed in category E, which means that all testing has produced negative results concerning carcinogens.

Since the use and application of pesticide chemicals is comprehensively regulated, the EPA and other agencies continually review the properties of these materials as exhibited in particular uses. The purpose of this review is to establish standards for applications of these materials to various crops and flora, to insure that no human or animal toxicity will result. While the EPA has not found Dichlobenil to be a carcinogen, the agency nevertheless routinely reviews the properties of these and other pesticidal products in the context of registration renewal. As part of such a routine review, the EPA included Dichlobenil on its most recent list for review published in Appendix C of the Federal Register notice, October 19, 1988. Appendix B of this same Federal Register notice lists the EPA "Food Use Herbicides With Evidence of Carcinogenicity." Dichlobenil is not on this list.

##### IV. MANUFACTURE AND IMPORTATION OF DICHLORBENIL

Under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), Casaron Technical



Grade 2,6-Dichlorobenzonitrile is classifiable under HTS item 2926.90.10.00.6. This item provides specifically for "nitrile-function compounds: \* \* \* Other: Aromatic \* \* \* Dichlorobenzonitrile," with duty at a rate of 6.8% ad valorem.

Casaron 85W, a mixture containing 2,6-dichlorobenzonitrile and other ingredients, is classifiable under HTS item 3803.30.10.00.0, which provides for "Herbicides," anti-sprouting products and plant growth regulators: Containing any aromatic or modified aromatic herbicide, anti-sprouting agent or plant growth regulator, dutiable at a rate of 1.8 cents per kilogram plus 9.7% ad valorem.

The industry situation has not changed since the passage of the original duty suspension measure. Dichlobenil is not manufactured by any firms in the United States. All Dichlobenil imported into the United States (and, consequently, all anti-sprouting preparations containing Dichlobenil) are manufactured in the Netherlands by Duphar, B.V. of Amsterdam which controls all United States registrations for the product. Uniroyal has a contract with Duphar to import Dichlobenil for the purpose of producing pre-emergent weed growth controllers which prevent the germination of weed seeds. This is a contract which is automatically renewed each year unless notice is given by either company one year prior to cancellation. The terms of registration are controlled by Duphar. This is not like a patent registration in that other manufacturers may produce the chemical, but in order for it to be used for the same registered purpose, a company must get approval from Duphar.

Dichlobenil is a narrow spectrum product and of limited demand. The incumbent costs to produce it in small quantities are uneconomical and consequently there is little incentive for United States companies to manufacture Dichlobenil. Uniroyal imports both Casaron Tech and Casaron 85W manufactured by Duphar. Dichlobenil formulations are produced at Uniroyal plants in Gastonia, North Carolina, and Fresno, California. In addition, some of these preparations are manufactured by Uniroyal "toll" processors throughout the United States.

A second United States firm, P.B.I. Gordon of Memphis, Tennessee, compounds Dichlobenil preparations as well. Like Uniroyal, P.B.I. Gordon obtains all of the Dichlobenil which it uses from Duphar in the Netherlands. (Dichlobenil is produced by a company in Japan. However, the Japanese product is not registered or approved for use in the United States, and consequently is not imported or used here.)

Various herbicides produced in the United States are used in some of the same applications as Dichlobenil; however, none of these have the exact properties and functions of Dichlobenil (e.g., for use on cranberries). Dichlobenil is not a herbicide, but rather a plant growth regulator; it does not kill or injure any existing plant or animal life, but it prevents the development of harmful seeds. Consequently, it may be said that Dichlobenil does not compete with any domestically produced products.

#### V. COSTS/SAVINGS

Casaron is a high cost product with a high duty rate. It is not imported in great quantities since its use is selective, although very important. Uniroyal Chemical Co. estimates that the total amount of Casaron 85W imported in 1991 was valued at \$1,010,600. The estimated duty savings for Uniroyal was \$98,821. During 1991, Uniroyal Chemical Co. imported no Casaron Tech, but will do so in the future.

Uniroyal has already benefitted greatly from the suspension of duties on the import of Casaron. If passed, the duty suspension would continue to allow United States formulators to import this essential chemical at lower costs and to function more efficiently and inexpensively. These savings would be passed on to growers, farmers and consumers.

#### VI. SOUND PUBLIC POLICY SUPPORTS THE ENACTMENT OF A DUTY SUSPENSION ON DICHLOBENIL

Enactment of this suspension would provide important benefits for United States agricultural and horticultural industries, without harming domestic manufacture. Several factors support its enactment.

First, no United States firms presently manufacture Dichlobenil, nor do any intend to do so. Only Duphar B.V. has obtained the OK for the use of its Dichlobenil product in the United States. While some other herbicides are used for the same purposes as Dichlobenil, none are directly competitive with it. Consequently, the extension of the duty suspension on Dichlobenil will not injure any United States manufacturing interest. To the contrary, the suspension would provide a major benefit for the United States facilities operated by Uniroyal Chemical, P.B.I. Gordon, and their toll processors, which are engaged in the manufacture of anti-sprouting compounds which contain Dichlobenil.

The duty suspension would also provide an important benefit to United States growers and consumers. Customs duties currently represent a significant portion of the landed cost of Dichlobenil. This duty cost is passed along to distributors of Dichlobenil-containing products and, ultimately, to farmers, growers, municipal agencies, and other users of anti-sprouting products containing Dichlobenil. The extension of the temporary suspension of the tariff on Dichlobenil would allow United States formulators to continue to import this essential chemical at lower costs and to manufacture anti-sprouting preparations more efficiently and inexpensively. Duty savings would continue to be passed on to United States consumers, growers, and farmers, and future price increases could be deferred or delayed.

In addition, this duty suspension would not significantly impact United States customs duty revenues. Consumer demand for Dichlobenil is relatively static, and it is expected that imports will not increase by more than 5,000 pounds per year. Enactment of the suspension would not affect this projection.

Finally, environmental considerations support enactment of a duty suspension. As noted above, Dichlobenil is a selective and pre-emergent anti-sprouting agent. Unlike ordinary pesticides, which attack pests and plants after they have sprouted, often harming the flora or fauna, Dichlobenil protects important crops by preventing the germination of harmful seeds. The use of Dichlobenil in the United States is carefully regulated by the EPA to insure human and animal safety. Dichlobenil has been registered with the EPA since 1964, and the EPA has approved numerous Dichlobenil formulations for use in the treatment of broadleaf weeds and grasses and aquatic weeds in a wide variety of applications. Unlike many ordinary herbicides, Dichlobenil has never been classified by the EPA as showing any evidence of carcinogenicity. The formulation, labeling and application of Dichlobenil-containing products are carefully regulated to insure that no adverse ecological consequences ensue from their use.

#### VII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, Uniroyal Chemical Co. supports the introduction and enactment of the proposed legislation.

Memorandum in Support of Proposed Legislation To Extend the Duty Suspension on 1[1-(4-CHLORO-2-(TRIFLUOROMETHYL)-PHENYL)IMINO]-2-PROPOXYETHYL]-1H-IMIDAZOLE

#### I. INTRODUCTION

This background statement on behalf of Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc. of Middlebury, Connecticut, provides information in support of proposed legislation to extend retroactively the former duty suspension on 1[1-(4-chloro-2-(trifluoromethyl)-phenyl)imino]-2-propoxyethyl]-1h-imidazole (see Attachment A). That suspension expired December 31, 1992, after Congress failed to enact miscellaneous tariff legislation. This product is known by its trade name of Trifluzimole.

The suspension on trifluzimole was first passed in 1990 as part of the "mini-trade" bill, and was included in the 102nd Congress' House-passed H.R. 4318, Miscellaneous Tariff Act. The draft legislation would extend until December 31, 1998, the suspension of the 13.5% ad valorem United States Customs duty on trifluzimole imports provided for under HTS subheading 2933.29.30.00.9, until December 31, 1996. The suspension was provided for in HTS subheading 9902.31.07.

#### II. DESCRIPTION AND USES OF TRIFLUZIMOLE

The chemical Trifluzimole, known by its registered brand names in the United States, "PROCURE and TERRAGUARD," falls under HTS subheading 2933.29.30.00.9. It is a powder which Uniroyal imports from Japan under exclusive license from Nippon Soda. Uniroyal formulates the imported technical grade material into "ready-to-use" active wettable powders. The product is utilized as a fungicide on ornamental plants and is being developed for use on deciduous fruits and to combat powdery mildew on grapes.

Trifluzimole was invented by the Japanese company, Nippon Soda, which holds the patent and the U.S. registration. To our knowledge, Uniroyal is the only importer of Trifluzimole. Uniroyal Chemical Company has an agreement to import and market the product and its compositions in the U.S. This license is effective as of January 1, 1989 and will be valid for 5 years.

In addition to its use to control cylindrocladium root rot disease on spathiphyllum ornamental foliage plants, Trifluzimole is being developed by Uniroyal to be utilized to control powdery mildew on grapes. Powdery mildew is one of the most devastating of the diseases to attack grapes. Each year, more than \$15 million are spent in attempts to control this disease. Currently sulphur and Bayleton are the two main products employed in the fight against powdery mildew but sulphur is quite irritating to workers during the application process and in recent years, Bayleton is being reported as failing in control of mildew perhaps because of resistance being developed by the disease.

Trifluzimole is also intended for use for the control of scab and mildew on apples. At present, Trifluzimole is being developed by Uniroyal Chemical for registration on apples, pears, stonefruit, grapes and other crops. For these products, Trifluzimole is currently for experimental use only. Trifluzimole is registered for its use on ornamental plants and was granted an emergency Section 18 registration by the EPA for its

use for the control cylindrocladium root rot disease on spathiphyllum ornamental foliage plants.

### III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Trifluralin is considered environmentally safe in that it has no adverse effects on birds or bees although it can be toxic to fish at high concentrations. It degrades quickly in the soil, is rapidly metabolized by plants and animals and does not bioaccumulate in fish.

### IV. MANUFACTURE AND IMPORTATION

The industry situation has not changed since the passage of the original duty suspension measure. Trifluralin is not manufactured in the United States. Because of the low demand, it is unlikely that any U.S. company will seek a license to manufacture Trifluralin in the U.S.. Uniroyal Chemical is the only current importer. Uniroyal imports the Tech grade and formulates it into finished products at plants in Gastonia, North Carolina and Fresno, California.

There are other competitive products on the market that are used in the U.S. for some of the same applications. These include Captan from Chevron, Funginex imported by FMC, and Dithane imported by Rohm and Haas. While these products are competitive in application, they are not competitive in their mode of action. There is no other product like Trifluralin manufactured in the United States.

### V. COST/SAVINGS

Trifluralin is a high cost product with a high duty rate. It is not imported in great quantities since its use is selective and in many cases, still experimental. Approximately 3,500 lbs. of Tech grades were imported in 1989 having a total value of \$127,260.00. The duty was approximately \$17,180,000 on these imports. Uniroyal has already benefitted greatly from the duty suspension on Trifluralin, which went into effect on October 1, 1990. If passed, the legislation would extend the benefits of the original duty suspension measure and save importers of trifluralin a total of approximately \$68,720.00 from December 31, 1992 through December 31, 1996. Savings resulting from the extension will assist in the development of the product for the benefit of the growers and the consumers.

### VI. CONCLUSION

There are no U.S. manufacture of Trifluralin. Consequently, the extension of the existing duty suspension will not cause injury to United States manufacturers nor should it injure other United States business interests. The product is environmentally safe and is of growing importance for agriculture and society. An extension of the temporary suspension will have a minimal revenue impact and could help encourage further use of Trifluralin in other applications by reducing its overall cost.

For the foregoing reasons, Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc. supports extension of the duty suspension.

By Mr. DECONCINI (for himself and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution designating the week beginning February 6, 1994, as "Lincoln Legacy Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### LINCOLN LEGACY WEEK

• Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I rise to introduce a joint resolution designating the week beginning February 6, 1994, as "Lincoln Legacy Week."

In the spring of 1989, students Carol Bien-Wilner, Lizz Cohen, Jamie Lewis, Carol Mach, Ilene Mass, and Heidi Sherman from Saguaro High School in Scottsdale, AZ, together with their history teacher, Mr. John Calvin, stood at the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. As they recalled the historic events that occurred there and reflected upon America's continuing commitment to democracy and liberty for all people, an idea was born. This moment was a catalyst for an inspired undertaking—the desire to create a museum at the Lincoln Memorial to commemorate the living legacy of Lincoln. These students pledged to work together to accomplish their goal.

The students began with a simple plan to place a plaque at the Lincoln Memorial commemorating Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, "I Have a Dream" speech. They collected 2,000 signatures in 4 days to support their proposal. They lobbied former Arizona Governor Rose Mofford for a proclamation in support of the project and she complied. During the fall of 1990, with the assistance of the American Federation of Teachers, they returned to Washington, DC, and presented their ideas to Members of Congress and received bipartisan support. When students met with National Park Service officials, they received a positive response. The Park Service had already been considering a similar project and welcomed student involvement. In March 1990, these young people attended the annual National Close-Up Program in Washington, DC, prepared to lobby the other 1,500 students attending the program. After many meetings with more congressional and other officials and many successes, they received bad news. The Commemorative Works Act prohibits placing plaques at national memorials. They were nevertheless undaunted by the news and forged ahead. Instead of a simple plaque, these students decided on a museum to commemorate all the accomplishments of Lincoln.

After a year of hard work and perseverance, the group from Arizona mobilized 17 students from 16 States who gathered together in Washington, DC, in November 1990 under the auspices of the American Federation of Teachers and the Close-Up Foundation, for an intensive study of Lincoln's legacy and a series of meetings with Park Service managers and exhibit specialists. The students played an active role in the meetings and even prepared designs for the museum. They were successful in maintaining the integrity of the project, and solicited ideas from students across the nation whose contributions will be reflected in the exhibits at what will be the Lincoln Memorial Museum.

In February 1992, a core group of students from across the Nation began a nationwide penny drive, appropriately

named "Pennies Make a Monumental Difference," to raise the \$300,000 necessary for the new Lincoln Memorial Museum. Their campaign, organized with very little private sector support, has been a success. The Lincoln Memorial Museum is scheduled to open in August 1993, the anniversary of King's historic "I Have a Dream" speech in Washington, DC. It will be a museum belonging not only to the thousands of young people who donated their pennies but to all peoples of the world. It is a shining example of what a grassroots effort is all about.

Mr. President, these young people were inspired by Lincoln to pursue a dream. They not only accomplished their goal, but have achieved much more. I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing our deep pride in the students across the Nation who through hard work and deep conviction have realized a dream by cosponsoring this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### S.J. RES. 83

Whereas Abraham Lincoln exemplified honesty and fairness to all people, generosity of spirit, and unswerving dedication to upholding democracy, human dignity, and the integrity of the United States of America;

Whereas February 12, 1994, marks the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln;

Whereas Abraham Lincoln is revered throughout the world for his vision of freedom and equality;

Whereas Abraham Lincoln's legacy of freedom and equality for all people continues to capture the imagination of humanity;

Whereas the life and ideals of Abraham Lincoln are commemorated by the Lincoln Memorial;

Whereas the Lincoln Memorial has served as a platform for individuals to exercise their democratic freedoms in support of civil rights, equal rights, and constitutional rights;

Whereas the legacy of Abraham Lincoln has inspired individuals in the United States, such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to gather at the Lincoln Memorial to share their dreams and lift their voices for a better United States;

Whereas the youth of the United States will display the ideals of freedom and civil rights by joining in the national "Pennies Make a Monumental Difference" campaign, which emphasizes the importance of the involvement of individuals;

Whereas during the week beginning February 6, 1994, students across the Nation will study the legacy of Abraham Lincoln and participate in the "Pennies Make a Monumental Difference" campaign to support new exhibits at the Lincoln Memorial; and

Whereas during the week beginning February 6, 1994, activities will occur that are designed to encourage people to promote the legacy of Abraham Lincoln and further the ideals of freedom and equality for all; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning



February 6, 1994, is designated as "Lincoln Legacy Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

By Mr. DOLE:

S.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution designating the week of June 1, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Week for the National Observance of the 50th Anniversary of World War II"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
WORLD WAR II

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I offer a joint resolution to commemorate the week of June 1 through June 7, 1993, as the National Observance of the 50th Anniversary of World War II.

It seems to me, that with the spread of democracy and freedom throughout the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, it is especially fitting that we now honor those brave Americans who fought and sacrificed during World War II to lay the foundation of this new freedom that continues to unfold in Europe.

No doubt about it, America's contribution during World War II was decisive in the defeat of the violent tyrannies that had ignited the most destructive war known to mankind. It was the bravery, productivity, and genius of the American people that made this vital victory possible.

The heroic contribution of the United States began long before the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941. Some examples were: American ships ensured that Great Britain kept its vital sea lanes open; American intelligence experts were breaking the codes that would be key to our future naval victories in the Pacific and the Atlantic; and the U.S. Army was perfecting the tactics that would allow our forces to take North Africa, Italy, and France. There were American volunteers actually flying combat missions over England and China in 1940.

When America entered World War II in full force, the American people were galvanized into action that would change the world, American valor in the air, at sea, and on the ground was supported by the extra efforts of the American farmers and factory workers, and we became the most productive Nation in history. Billions of tons of ships, aircraft, and vehicles were produced at unprecedented rates. And, as the arsenal of democracy became an awesome reality to our enemies, American farmers produced enough food to literally feed the world. It is also very important to remember that our productive farmers saved both our Allies as well as our defeated enemies from starvation after the war.

Our Nation's productivity was exceeded only by its creative genius, American science and technology gave us the ability to transform imagina-

tion into reality, with an engineer's exacting precision. The computers would increase our capabilities in all fields. New medical techniques and pharmaceuticals would provide new possibilities in health care. New materials and processes would forever change our manufacturing and construction techniques.

Moreover, the years between 1940 and 1945 were a time of great transition for our Nation. Internationally, we became a superpower. Domestically, we experienced great social changes, as vast population shifts changed the demographics of our Nation, and women took on new and important challenges in the workplace which would redefine their roles in society.

The week of June 1 to June 7, is especially significant to our Nation. It was during this first week in June 1942, when the Battle of Midway was raging, that our naval forces dealt a devastating blow to the imperial Japanese Navy, a victory so complete, that they never recovered. Also in this same week in 1944, Americans liberated Rome from the fascists and stormed the beaches of Normandy to liberate Europe from the Nazis.

Mr. President, I believe it is most appropriate to honor these brave men and women of this Nation who gave their all so that others could live in freedom. Their supreme sacrifice for freedom and democracy 50 years later is being realized. I, therefore, send this joint resolution to the desk to authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation establishing the week June 1 to June 7, 1993, as the Week of the National Observance of the 50th Anniversary of World War II.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 84

Whereas the brave men and women of the United States made tremendous sacrifices during World War II to save the world from tyranny and aggression;

Whereas the winds of freedom and democracy sweeping the globe today spring from the principles for which over four hundred thousand Americans gave their lives in World War II;

Whereas World War II and the events that led up to that war must be understood in order that we may better understand our own times, and more fully appreciate the reasons why eternal vigilance against any form of tyranny is so important;

Whereas the World War II era, as reflected in its family life, industry, and entertainment, was a unique period in American history, and epitomized our Nation's philosophy of hard work, courage, and tenacity in the face of adversity;

Whereas, between 1991 and 1995, over nine million United States veterans of World War II will be holding reunions and conferences and otherwise commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of various events relating to World War II; and

Whereas June 4, 1993, marks the anniversary of the beginning of the Battle of Midway, and June 6, 1993, marks the anniversary of D-Day; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of June 1, 1993, through June 7, 1993, is designated as a "Week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to combat violence and crimes against women on the streets and in homes.

S. 20

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 20, a bill to provide for the establishment, testing, and evaluation of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 55

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 55, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes.

S. 70

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to reauthorize the National Writing Project, and for other purposes.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to ensure that agencies establish the appropriate procedures for assessing whether or not regulation may result in the taking of private property, so as to avoid such where possible.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 216, a bill to provide for the minting of coins to commemorate the World University Games.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Montana

[Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain cash rentals of farmland will not cause recapture of special estate tax valuation.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to protect children from exposure to environmental tobacco smoke in the provision of children's services, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate guidelines for instituting a non-smoking policy in buildings owned or leased by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 342

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 342, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage investment in real estate and for other purposes.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] were added as cosponsors of S. 360, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals for an indefinite period, and to increase the amount of such deduction.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to require a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2000 and each year thereafter, to protect Social Security, to provide for zero-based budgeting and decennial sunset, to impose spending caps on the growth of entitlements during fiscal years 1994 through 2000, and to enforce those requirements through a budget process involving the President and Congress and sequestration.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent, and to increase to 100 percent, the deduction of self-employed individuals for health insurance costs.

S. 448

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 448, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for

additional certification requirements for certain licenses and permits, and for other purposes.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MIKULSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 487, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and modify the low-income housing tax credit.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to identify and curtail fraud in the food stamp program, and for other purposes.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] were added as cosponsors of S. 545, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow farmers' cooperatives to elect to include gains or losses from certain dispositions in the determination of net earnings, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit for the portion of employer social security taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 575, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to improve the provisions of such Act with respect to the health and safety of employees, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 600, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the targeted jobs credit.

S. 660

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 660, a bill to require the preparation of community economic adjustments plans before the closure or realignment of military installations under base closure laws.

S. 670

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] was added as a cosponsor of

S. 670, a bill to amend the Head Start Act to make quality improvements in Head Start programs, and for other purposes.

S. 716

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 716, a bill to require that all Federal lithographic printing be performed using ink made from vegetable oil, and for other purposes.

S. 763

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 763, a bill to amend section 1729 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs medical care cost-recovery program.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to require that 4-gallon to 6-gallon buckets distributed in commerce bear a permanent label warning of a potential drowning hazard to young children, and for other purposes.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 47

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 47, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning on November 21, 1993, and the week beginning on November 20, 1994, each as "National Family Week".

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 72

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 72, a joint resolution to designate the last week of September 1993, and the last week of September of 1994, as "National Senior Softball Week".

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that equitable mental health care benefits must be included in any health care reform legislation passed by Congress.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 79

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 79, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the United Nation's arms embargo against Bosnia-Herzegovina, a



nation's right to self-defense, and peace negotiations.

# NOTICES OF HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a hearing on pending nominations on Wednesday, April 28, 1993 at 10 a.m. in SR-332.

For further information please contact Chris Sarcone of the committee staff at 224-2035.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold a hearing on Wednesday, April 28, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, on "Oversight of Federal Trade Data: What We Don't Know Could Hurt Us."

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Mineral Resources Development and Production.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on hardrock mining royalty issues and written statements on S. 775, the Hardrock Mining Reform Act of 1993.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, May 4, 1993, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets, NE, Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for inclusion in the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC, attention: Lisa Vehmas.

For further information, please contact Lisa Vehmas of the subcommittee staff at 202/224-7555.

### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, April 21, 1993, at 9:30 a.m. in open/closed session, to receive testimony from the unified commanders on their military strategy and operational requirements, and the defense authorization request for fiscal year 1994 and the future years defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 21, 1993 at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on terrorism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a joint hearing on the Comprehensive Child Immunization Act of 1993, with the House Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 21 at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### HISTORICAL PRESERVATION COMMENDATION

• Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize several Arizonans and to congratulate them for their historical preservation efforts, reflected in the recently restored 1925 La Casita de Maria, a home located in Paradise Valley, AZ. La Casita de Maria owners Jan & Bill Frieder, architect John C. Douglas, AIA, of Douglas Architecture and Planning, and Christine E. Ten Eyck, of the Planning Center spent 9 months designing a restoration plan for the project, which included replacing foreign landscaping with exclusively southwestern plants and making renovations to the 68-year-old adobe home.

Mr. President, the restoration was grounded in the concept of making La Casita de Maria as authentic as possible, and I am pleased to report that their project has met with complete success. The grounds were recently featured in the January/February issue of the National Trust's magazine, Historic Preservation, where it captured Second Prize for Landscape in the magazine's Fourth Annual Great American Home Awards. The honor is especially significant because it is the first Arizona project to win a National Trust Award. In addition, the home and grounds have garnered 12 design awards over the past several months, including 1992 awards from the American Institute of Architects and the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The commitment made by these individuals to restore a part of Arizona history reflects a growing interest in Arizona to preserve our rich heritage so that future generations can appreciate the unique history of the Southwest. I highly commend their efforts and con-

gratulate them for the awards they have won. •

## PACIFIC WHITING DECISION

• Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the Department of Commerce issued a set of fishery regulations last week which threatens to do great harm to the coastal economy of my State. These regulations are even more disturbing because of the way in which they were promulgated.

The fishery in question is Pacific Whiting. The regulations deal with the allocation of fishing privileges between various sectors of the industry. Federal law provides a comprehensive and detailed system of regional fishery management under which regulations are to be crafted. The Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act created a group of eight regional councils which are charged with the task of developing proposed fishery management rules. The councils gather scientific data, hold public hearings, debate the issues, and then make recommendations to the Secretary of Commerce. In the case of Pacific Whiting, the council and the region have invested significant time and resources in developing an equitable allocation system for this fishery.

It is largely because of the great deal of effort and compromise which went into the crafting of this plan that I am so disturbed about what took place last week. The Commerce Department, after issuing a proposed rule very similar to that suggested by the Pacific Fishery Management Council, made an 11th-hour change and issued a rule which was a 180-degree reversal of its own proposal. Without getting into questions about why this may have been done, let me discuss the negative impacts the decision will have.

The economy of the Oregon coast has traditionally depended on two sources of jobs and revenue: timber and fishing. I need not go into detail about the woes of the timber industry. Oregon's coastal fisheries have also seen a general decline over the last decade, but the Pacific Whiting fishery offered new opportunities in the fishing industry. The allocation plan proposed by the Pacific Fishery Management Council would have provided further stability for Oregon's coastal economy.

Unfortunately, as a result of the Commerce Department's rejecting the plan, the coastal communities of my State face a bleaker economic future. The vast majority of the Pacific Whiting resource, under the Commerce's plan, will now be given to large factory trawler ships from Seattle for which the Pacific Whiting resource is but a minor component of their economic livelihood. In fact, the amount of fish which had originally been proposed for the small-boat fleet and the onshore processing plants would have lasted

them well into the fall. Now, these same fishermen will be out of work and coastal plants will be shut down by the end of June. The result will be that workers and local economies will lose millions of dollars and hundreds of jobs.

Of longer term concern is what this action says about the administration's view of regional management of natural resources. Not long ago, the President, Vice President, and many members of the President's Cabinet visited Oregon for the timber summit. The President provided a very clear policy statement that the best way to work out the dilemmas we face is through scientifically based regional management measures.

It was exactly such a measure which the Pacific Fishery Management Council crafted and presented to the Secretary of Commerce for resolving the allocation disputes in the whiting fishery. And what was the response from the administration? They responded by summarily rejecting the council's proposal and substituting a far different plan of their own making.

How much confidence can such an action give to the many regional agencies and industry groups who are struggling with the problems of the timber harvest and endangered species? In the light of the rejection of the council's whiting plan, many groups involved in management of the timber resource may ask: Why bother? If the administration is going to substitute its judgment for that of the people of the region, then what is the point of pursuing regional strategies?

Mr. President, unlike the plan agreed to by the region, the final rule published by the Department of Commerce is a 1-year rule. The Pacific Fishery Management Council's original plan was a long-term solution to this continuing issue. The goal of the long-term solution offered by the council was to provide a stable, predictable base for this fishery.

The 1-year fix chosen by Commerce means we will be asking the region to once again go through this process—the same process they have followed for the last 2 years. It is my hope for the short term that the Commerce Department will realize the error it has made and will restore the original proposal which its own managers recommended. But perhaps more importantly, it is my hope that in the long term the administration will recall its own recent statements of commitment to regional management and will not continue to fall prey to the insidious notion that Federal bureaucrats in Washington, DC, are the source of all wisdom.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO TOMPKINSVILLE

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to

Tompkinsville, an outstanding town located in south central Kentucky.

Tompkinsville is the county seat of Monroe County, which is located on the Kentucky-Tennessee border. The town is situated on the Eastern Pennyroyal Plateau and lies west of the Barren and Cumberland Rivers.

Tompkinsville and Monroe County have the distinction of being the only county and county seat named for a U.S. President and Vice President who served together. Tompkinsville and Monroe County were named around 1820, the year James Monroe of Virginia and Daniel Tompkins were re-elected to our Nation's highest offices.

Although agriculture is the traditional base for Monroe County's economy, it is the growing manufacturing community which employs many Tompkinsville residents. Industries like a fiber optics manufacturer, a garment company which produces jeans for the Gap, and a busy sawmill keep the area's unemployment rate at 5 percent, which is below the State's average.

Perhaps Tompkinsville's most important resource is its residents. Due to Tompkinsville's colorful political history, citizens have learned to be self-reliant. Tompkinsville has become a community of individuals dedicated to hard work and a bright future.

Mr. President, I salute Tompkinsville and the good people who call this Kentucky town home. I honor them for their dedication to growth and prosperity, and I encourage them to continue on their path to success.

Mr. President, I request that an article from Louisville's *Courier-Journal* be included in today's RECORD.

The article follows:

#### TOMPKINSVILLE

(By Al Cross)

The drive down Main Street through the heart of Tompkinsville shows little sign that the Monroe County seat has changed much in the last decade or two.

On the north side of town is the office of the Board of Education, still a leading employer. Closer to the square is the home of James C. Carter Jr., the former circuit judge whose family made the schools and county offices political employment agencies for most of this century. At least three local businesses announce the 30th birthday of someone named Tootie, and the closet Wal-Mart is half an hour away. A short drive east is Kentucky's only state-operated ferry; not far west is a place called Bugtussle.

But on the same road to that old ferry is a new airport. Along a newly widened boulevard is a plant that makes optical fiber, a hospital that paid off its debt 12 years early and the headquarters of a company that is the county's top employer and the main jeans supplier for the nation's second-best-selling line of clothing. And the county's oldest industry, sawmilling, seems healthier than ever, with growing exports and new injections of capital.

Tompkinsville is still a small town with second-class roads and other disadvantages, but "all this industry's picked it up," said Bill Stephens, one of several home-grown

manufacturers on whom the county once depended—and now one of its newest entrepreneurs, as the owner of a successful motel.

The county's per-capita income and housing values still trail the state's, but are catching up. School enrollment is rising after a decade of decline, and new hires by the jeans maker helped drive unemployment down last year to an average of 5 percent, well below most recent years and lower than the state figure.

"Everybody in Monroe County who wants a job has got a job. They may not be making all the money they'd like to make, but this is a high-employment area," said James Graves, the school superintendent since 1980. "We have to recruit now to hire custodians, to hire bus drivers. When I first came along people would kill for a janitor's job."

As government jobs became less important and the Carter family lost power, the county was transformed—not from the Republicanism it has followed since the Civil War, but from a factional patronage system.

"The economics of the matter have changed," said state Republican Rep. Richard Turner, who steered a largely independent course through what could be called the Carter War of the late 1970s and early 1980s.

"This thing is docile now," Turner said. "The social event of the year used to be an election. People would come from miles around just to watch the spectacle. Now it's the Watermelon Festival. Thank goodness for that."

Graves said: "There's not really any major political faction in the county now. It depends on the election. People come and go as they will."

Without two warring factions, "People have become more aware of actual issues rather than thinking of personalities," said Blanche Bushong Trimble, editor and publisher of the Tompkinsville News. She and others said the war's end led to cooperation on projects such as the airport.

The Carter War, which began with a family split over a school board race in 1975 and was fueled by a shortage of young Carters to inherit the political mantle, ended "basically because of necessity," said Turner. Unless Carters and other Republicans are unified, Democrats and independents can capture local office, as they did in 1985 when a Democrat beat Turner for judge-executive and an independent was elected sheriff.

The war had some bizarre battles and characters. An election for Republican Party officers in a single precinct in 1982 drew 250 voters, more than usually vote in regular elections. The anti-Carter candidate won the ensuing election for GOP chairman by a single vote. In 1983, a district judge jailed the circuit court clerk and her lawyer husband, who later tried to kick the judge in the groin. In the same year, the judge signed warrants for Election Day arrests of the judge-executive and a school board member (both Carters) and two former county officials on election-law charges.

The war pretty much ended in 1986, the first year that no Carter held elective office since 1983—and the year that Election Day chicanery was chilled by the federal conviction of a Monroe County man for vote fraud in a school board election. At year's end, Dr. James Carter, the former circuit judge's nephew, regained his school board seat and struck a truce with the opposition.

"He's a Carter, but not like the old Carters used to be," said Mayor Veachel Harlan. "It used to be rough. . . . They just had control over everything."

"I waved the olive branch," Carter recalled. "I told them I wasn't interested in



creating any dynasty, that I was interested in working with them for the betterment of the schools."

There is agreement in Tompkinsville that the alliance has produced results, especially in new, consolidated high and middle schools. "We now have totally modern facilities for every child" with programs to match, Graves said. "There's been a conscious effort on behalf of the school board and the courthouse people to keep politics out of the school elections," Carter said. "And us people on the school board don't want to be seen as trying to influence the county elections."

Carter said he doesn't believe the long-told tales that his clan's elders discouraged industry and progress. But until six or eight years ago, most people in Tompkinsville felt the local political situation discouraged development, said Ken Johnson, chairman of the city-county airport board. "It's probably true, too," said Johnson, a Paducah native who has been Monroe County's soil conservationist for 16 years.

Johnson is among those trying to take the county's forest industries beyond rudimentary shipping pallets to dimension cutting and planing to order for furniture makers. A dimension mill would employ only 30 people but would increase employment at the area's sawmills—and could be a step toward getting a furniture plant.

Tompkinsville seems well situated for such enterprises. It lies near the middle of the Highland Rim, a band of hardwood-forested hills that lie just west of the Cumberland Plateau in Tennessee and Southern Kentucky. "We have a near-unlimited raw supply," Johnson said. "We have the know-how here to get it done, if we can just get it focused in the right place."

"There's a real work ethic among the people here," said Bill Boner of Nashville, president of the county's largest pallet mill, Graham Pallet & Lumber Co., which he bought in late 1991 with a group headed by Ray Danner, former chief executive of Shoney's. Boner, the music city's colorful former mayor and congressman, is a Democrat who voted in Monroe County last year.

Forestry businesses usually have low wages and few benefits. Locals say the best wages are paid at the electronic-wire and fiber-optic plant of Cooper Industries' Belden Division, which opened in 1983. "Belden has helped our community more than anything," said Peggy Stephens, who said Belden produces half the customers at the new motel she and her husband own.

Turner and others give more credit to home-grown industries that have been key employers over the years—most recently Kentucky Apparel and Laundry Co., a jeans maker that employs about 750 people in Monroe County and nearly 2,000 in the region. The company was started in 1982 by Dan Waggoner, a Tennessean who had managed an apparel plant for another company in nearby Gamabel. Now he has a dozen plants, almost all producing for The Gap, a successful retail chain.

"As The Gap grew, we grew," at a rate of about 30 percent a year, said Jerry George, the company's controller.

Local boosters would like to recruit plants that pay better wages than the \$4.80 hourly base at Kentucky Apparel, and the No. 1 item on their want list has long been a better road to the north. "There's just no good way to get in and out," George said.

Tompkinsville is one of the few county seats in Kentucky not served by a primary highway. Its main north-south artery, Ky.

163, is due for improvement in two years, but not even to the county line—much less to the Cumberland Parkway, Harlan and others are trying to revive an old idea, a north-south road that would connect Interstate 65 at Cave City with I-40 and/or I-24 in Tennessee.

Merchants say the town once attracted much business from the small, rural counties across the state line, but now sends more business to Tennessee because roads and shopping have improved there. That's the latest example of Tompkinsville's divided loyalties. Nashville is 25 miles closer than Louisville, and the local cable-TV system has only two Kentucky stations and no Louisville station.

"Our part of the state is hard-put to know what's going on in the rest of Kentucky," Trimble said, "because most of our news is from Tennessee."

Merchants also worry that they're losing business to other, larger towns. "Our money is going to Tennessee or Bowling Green or Glasgow," said Anita Hamilton, who owns a barbecue restaurant but thinks the town needs more places to eat.

"We just don't have the people here anymore, the crowds, like we used to," said retired car dealer Tom Dotson. "They've got these big Wal-Marts everywhere, and every time they move a load of dirt here, somebody starts a rumor there's going to be one here."

Dotson, who retired last year after 46 years of selling Chevrolets but still claims a loafer's chair at the dealership, is among those who see a shortage of civic capital in Tompkinsville. "Seems like we don't have anybody working for anything, he said.

That may be because Tompkinsville has a way of letting individuals take the lead.

"We try to be self-reliant," Turner said. "Our political history has made us that way."

Big employers: Kentucky Apparel & Laundry Co. (jeans), 703; Monroe County schools, 320; Cooper Industries' Belden Division (electronic wire and cable), 230; Red Kap Industries (men's overalls, shirts), 180; Key Industries Inc. (jeans), 143; Stephens Manufacturing (concrete processing and air-pollution-control equipment), 80.

Media: Newspaper—Monroe County Citizen and Tompkinsville News (both weeklies). Television: Nashville, Bowling Green and Campbellsville stations. Radio: WTKY AM-FM (country music).

Education: Monroe County schools, 2,162 students; Monroe County Area Vocational Education Center, 247 students.

Transportation: Roads—Ky. 163, 100 and 63. Ky. 214 crosses the Cumberland River by way of Kentucky's only free, state-operated ferry. Air—Tompkinsville-Monroe County Airport, 4,000-foot runway. Nearest commercial service is at Nashville. Truck: Served by 11 lines. Rail—none.

Topography: Eastern Pennyroyal Plateau, with limestone and siltstone eroded by creeks. Tompkinsville lies just west of the drainage divide between the Barran River and the Cumberland River, which winds through the more wooded eastern end of Monroe County before entering Tennessee.

Jobs (1990): Manufacturing, 1,801; agriculture, 834; state/local government, 834.

Per capita income (1990): Monroe County, \$12,208, or \$2,784 below state average.

Population (1990): Tompkinsville, 2,861; Monroe County, 11,401.

#### FAMOUS FACTS AND FIGURES

Tompkinsville is a town with all its marbles. The Tennessee-Kentucky Sharpshooters, a marbles team with Ron

Bransbetter and Bobby Dyer of Monroe County and four players from adjoining Clay County, Tenn., won the British and world championships last April. In July, 14-year-old Wesley Tompson and his 10-year-old cousin, Nathan Thompson, both of Tompkinsville, were winner and runner-up in a national tournament for children 14 and under. Kentucky and Tennessee have a shootout at the annual Watermelon Festival in Tompkinsville.

Monroe County has a singular style of barbecue: Pork shoulder sliced thinner than pork chops, cooked slowly over hickory coals and daubed with a peppery, vinegar-based sauce. It is served on white bread.

Old Mulroy Meeting House near Tompkinsville, built in 1804, is a state shrine and the oldest log meeting house in Kentucky. Hannah Boone Parrington, a sister of Daniel Boone, is buried in the church graveyard.

Monroe County and Tompkinsville are the only county and county seat named for a vice president and president who served together: James Monroe of Virginia and Daniel Tompkins of New York, who held office from 1817 to 1825. The town was named in 1819, when it was incorporated after being known as Watson's Store. The county was created in 1820, the year Monroe and Tompkins were re-elected.

Members of the Carter family held many offices, none longer than circuit judge. The bench was held by James C. Carter Sr. from 1910 through 1948 and by his son, James C. Carter Jr., from 1946 through 1983, a total of 74 years.

Hassel Halle made fine guitars in a workshop behind his home for Chet Atkins and other stars. Halle died in 1986.●

#### IN TRIBUTE TO MARY J. PAGE

● **Mr. DURENBERGER.** Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mary J. Page of Olivia, MN.

Today, in St. Paul, Mary is being honored with the 1993 Susan B. Anthony Award for her pioneering efforts in government, in demonstrating what women accomplish, and for her commitment to supporting other women in public life. This award is bestowed upon her by the Minnesota Center for Women in Government at Hamline University. She is the first rural resident to receive this honor.

The list of contributions by Mary Page to the people of Olivia, to Renville County, to southwestern Minnesota, and to our State is long and distinguished.

Mary's life is a litany of service which includes serving on the Renville County Board of Commissioners, the University of Minnesota Board of Regents, mayor of Olivia, the Southwest Minnesota Initiative Fund, the Countryside Council, Lutheran Social Service, Rice Memorial Hospital, court services guardian ad litem, leadership positions within her church, and numerous steering committees, charter board memberships, and planning commissions for hospices, mental health associations, and economic development.

Mary Page's influence, her pioneering efforts, her clarity of thought and

inspiration reaches from her own family to men and women in a sphere of generations. She has shared not only her gifts with all of us, but has helped reveal our own gifts to ourselves.●

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL ODDO

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a truly heroic New Yorker. Bill Oddo is a man who is courageous beyond words. During the horror of the terrorist bombing of the World Trade Center on February 23, 1993, Bill Oddo risked his own life to save another. Bill Oddo, a resident of Stuy Town and a member of Community Board Six, thought not of himself but for the safety of Katy MacKay, a wheelchair-bound woman whom he stayed with for more than 6 hours and helped carry down 67 flights. Mr. Oddo, an engineer with the Port Authority, was on the 73d floor when the bomb blast occurred. In an effort to evacuate the building, he met other Port Authority employees who helped assist Ms. MacKay down the 48th floor. With the help of several Port Authority officials, Oddo carried MacKay and her wheelchair down to the lobby. Oddo took the lead in this rescue, often walking backward down the smoky stairwells so Ms. MacKay would not be left behind.

Bill Oddo is a true hero. He did not think of himself first. He could have, like many others, evacuated the building by the quickest route. His first thought was to help others.

I salute him for his heroism.●

#### SALUTING GEORGE SHERVEY

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to note the recent passing of George Shervey—a man who accomplished more in his retirement than many of us accomplish in a lifetime. George, who was known by many friends as "Mr. Grant County," died April 1 at the age of 88.

George Shervey was one of those pioneer spirits who make small town life such an important part of Minnesota. He devoted his preretirement years to a variety of agribusinesses and civic contributions through a number of local government and community service positions.

But, it was after his retirement from the farm equipment business in 1966 that George devoted almost full time to his love for the history of his home communities in west-central Minnesota.

George was fortunate to live in a county with a strong tradition of honoring its past and, especially for its size, an extremely active and well-funded county historical society. George's postretirement contribution was to make that tradition come alive expanding and further developing Grant County's highly regarded historical society museum in Elbow Lake.

George was also something of a local character, well known for his earthy sense of humor and his warm smile and twinkling eyes. Those eyes are now closed. But, the contributions of this remarkable individual will live on to be enjoyed and remembered by all those who follow.

Mr. President, because of the outstanding contributions George Shervey made to his home communities in Grant County, I would ask that the following tributes to George—written by Grant County Herald publisher Dave Simpkins—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The material follows:

#### GEORGE SHERVEY'S HISTORICAL WORKS WERE A LABOR OF LOVE (By Dave Simpkins)

Grant County history lost a friend Thursday with the death of George Shervey.

The 88-year-old retired implement dealer and local historian dedicated most of the last 25 years of his life to preserving the history of Grant county and its people.

Funeral services were held Tuesday, April 6, 1993 at the United Lutheran Church in Elbow Lake.

Shervey was born northwest of Barrett in 1904. His father Sivert had immigrated from Norway and his grandfather was a pioneer.

He graduated from West Central School of Agriculture with a major in dairy herdsmanhood in 1924.

Shervey turned down a job as a herdsman near Milwaukee because he needed to help his aging mother. So he took a job as a mechanic at an implement store in Barrett.

Shervey moved into sales as tractors were replacing horses on farms.

Shervey liked to tell how he told farmers a horse would eat all year long but a tractor only needs to be fed while you use it.

Shervey was also proud to have sold the first milking machines in Grant County.

In 1934 Shervey married Gladys Johnson of Brandon. On his wedding night a band of his friends kidnapped him, tied him up and left him on an island on Barrett Lake for an hour.

The Sherveys had three children, Constance, Barbara and Charles.

While in Barrett Shervey served as mayor, fire chief, councilman, village treasurer, secretary of the Commercial Club, secretary of the Barrett Meat Locker Association, board member of the telephone company and deacon of the church.

In 1945 Shervey entered into a partnership with Anton Christianson of Wendell to form the Christianson-Shervey Implement Company.

In Elbow Lake Shervey served as president of the Lion's Club, president of the Grant County American Revolution Bi-Centennial Committee where he worked on the Grant County Wagon Train project, he served as vice-president of the Senior Citizen's Club and also as vice-president of the Grant County Old Settler's Association.

After Christianson's death, Shervey sold his interest in the company and went to work for the Elbow Lake Auto Implement Company and later sold implements for Aamot and Ellingson Implement Company until his retirement in 1966.

But Shervey didn't have a traditional retirement. He went to work as curator of the Grant County Historical Museum where he left his biggest mark.

Shervey dedicated the next 20 years of his life to Grant County history, working 12

hour days, seven days a week recording the lives of early pioneers as well as maintaining files on many residents.

He accumulated 20,000 family history cards as well as 70 oral history tapes.

Shervey once told a reporter from the Fergus Falls Daily Journal, "I work full-time and then some because I like it. I love to preserve the past for the future. That makes working with the museum a labor of love."

#### GEORGE M. SHERVEY WAS HISTORY (By Dave Simpkins)

George Shervey liked to say he spent so much time working around fossils at the Grant County Historical Museum he was becoming a fossil himself.

The dictionary defines a fossil as an old plant or animal that has left an imprint on the crust of the earth revealing life in past ages.

Boy, that really describes George and the job he did preserving history at the Grant County Museum. For 20 years he dominated the museum and worked tirelessly to gather artifacts, celebrate centennials and record the stories of the people who have lived in this corner of the world through the ages.

The museum's walk down Main Street, the log home, the school house and the many files of family histories are all parts of his legacy.

George's funeral will be a sad one for us at the Herald office.

George was a friend of ours. I met him my first week in town while doing research on a feature story. Twice a day he would make a brief stop in the office to share a small bit of nonsense or a recent tidbit of history he had discovered.

He liked to say there was nothing new in history, just different things to discover.

Like the good horse trader he liked to say he was, he worked out a deal with us. He provided us with all the pictures and research we needed for stories and we'd give the museum copies of the paper so he could clip out items on people to put in his family history files. He put in many hours filing those clippings.

George was the kind of town character I wish we'd have more of.

Dressed in a sport coat and bow tie, he had a rare sense of humor that we don't hear too much anymore.

He also told us he came into the Herald office to see if his name was in the obituary column yet.

Many times he'd be wearing a bear claw necklace or carrying some kind of trick with him.

George was not only a preserver of history, he also was history. His Norwegian twang, earthy humor and memories of growing up on the prairies gave you the feeling you were talking with history.

I particularly enjoyed the stories his grandmother told him about the Indians and the ox carts rolling through the county 100 years ago.

It is a shame someone didn't video George giving a group of children a tour of his museum.

Anyone can point out an artifact, but nobody will ever be able to put his colorful twist on things.

George had the perfect retirement. He was active in senior citizen groups and gave many talks on keeping active in old age.

When he left the museum he had plenty of projects, from feeding pheasants to driving the neighborhood kids to Sunday School when their parents couldn't.

After a few laughs George would be in a hurry to move on to his next stop but before



he left he would always say, "Thanks for the fun."

George, thanks for the fun.●

#### TO COSPONSOR S. 763, CREDITING THIRD-PARTY REIMBURSEMENTS FOR TREATMENT AT VA FACILITIES

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my colleague from Minnesota in supporting legislation that is important to the health care of veterans all over the country. Everyone knows, I think, that the rising costs of health care are making it more and more difficult to make certain that all Americans who need care are adequately served. We are working on a plan to address our national health care needs and, hopefully, we will begin to consider a plan for major health care reform here in the Congress in just a few months. But even as we address the health care needs of all of our citizens, I think we need to pay particular attention to the availability of care for those women and men who have served in the military. This legislation, S. 763, will, I believe, be a significant step toward assuring that all veterans are able to receive the treatment they need within the VA medical system.

As things currently stand, veterans who have service related medical needs or who have very low incomes are able to receive care from the VA without charge. Other veterans, those without service connected problems or with higher incomes, have been able to seek treatment at the VA and draw on their own insurance to pay for that treatment since the enactment of Public Law 99-272 a few years ago. This has been a very important opportunity for those veterans who would not otherwise qualify for treatment in VA medical centers and it goes a long way to fulfilling the promise of lifelong health care that we make to those who serve.

At the same time, the medical care cost recovery program has enabled the VA to collect sorely needed funds from sources other than the Federal budget. From 1987 to 1992 \$1.1 billion was collected under this program and, I am proud to note, the Minneapolis Veterans Administration Health Center [VAMC] led the country, collecting \$8,575,487 in 1992 alone. If we continue to allow VA medical centers to collect these third-party payments we can expect to see an increasing number of veterans choose to use their services. This will, in turn, make more resources available to those medical centers, without any need for higher appropriations. This is, I think my colleagues will agree, a very attractive idea.

And it is precisely what we are seeking to do in this legislation. This initiative is similar to one introduced in the last Congress by my fellow Minnesotan, TIM PENNY. Our goal is three-

fold. First, we would like to make permanent the ability of VA medical centers to collect third-party payments for treatments of those veterans who have their own insurance. This would open up the VA system to more veterans and bring in more resources. In Minnesota, the VAMC people think they can double the amount of third-party funds they have brought in in recent years if there was an incentive to do so. By making this provision permanent, we would help them to do this.

Second, this bill would change the way these funds are distributed. Until now, VA medical centers have had to invest personnel and time in collecting the funds, only to send them directly to the U.S. Treasury. Some of this money, but not all of it, has found its way back down to the VAMC's. Our goal with this bill would be to make certain that all of the funds collected would remain with the medical center that did the collecting. This would provide a greater incentive for the local VA medical center to seek out these funds and, consequently, the patients that go with them. It would help to stave off the chronic underfunding of the Veterans' Administration health care system.

Which brings me to our third purpose. We indicate in the bill our desire that none of these third-party payments should be counted against the VA medical centers in determining appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs each year. It is not clear to me that we can in fact require this through legislation without having to waive our budget rules. However, what is clear is that by unleashing the local VA medical centers to go after third-party payments and to seek out veterans who have not previously qualified for treatment at VA facilities, we would be taking an important step in reinventing government, a step clearly in line with President Clinton's priorities. It is my hope that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will be able to find a way to protect the appropriations for the VA while still encouraging the collection of third-party payments.

Mr. President, I am proud to join with my colleague from Minnesota in proposing this legislation. This bill makes sense—it would expand access to Veterans medical services for veterans who might not otherwise be able to access those services and it would do so while bringing additional financial resources into the VA medical system. It would do all this without requiring any additional appropriations from Congress. This is, as I have said, precisely the kind of imaginative legislation that we must continue to pursue if we really do intend to reinvent government. I thank Senator DURENBERGER for introducing this bill and I call on my colleagues to join me in support of it.●

#### ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 2 p.m. Thursday, April 22; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with Senators BRADLEY and FEINSTEIN recognized for up to 15 minutes each, and Senators REID and GRAMM of Texas for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. For the information of the Senate, under an order obtained earlier, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the EPA Cabinet-level bill at 3 p.m. Thursday, April 22. On Thursday, consideration of the bill will be limited to debate only.

#### RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:07 p.m. recessed until Thursday, April 22, 1993, at 2 p.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 20, 1993, after the recess of the Senate, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WENDY RUTH SHERMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE JANET GARDNER MULLINS.

DOUGLAS JOSEPH BENNET, JR., OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE JOHN R. BOLTON, RESIGNED.

JOHN HOWARD FRANCIS SHATTUCK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS, VICE PATRICIA DIAZ DENNIS, RESIGNED.

ALEXANDER FLETCHER WATSON, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE BERNARD WILLIAM ARONSON, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

NICOLAS P. RETSINAS, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE ARTHUR J. HILL, RESIGNED.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21, 1993:

##### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EUGENE BRANSTOOL, OF OHIO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE JO ANN D. SMITH, RESIGNED.

EUGENE BRANSTOOL, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, VICE JO ANN D. SMITH, RESIGNED.

##### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

KENNETH D. BRODY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM OF 4 YEARS EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 1997, VICE JOHN D. MACOMBER, RESIGNED.

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SALLY KATZEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND

REGULATORY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE S. JAY PLAGER, RESIGNED.

PHILLIP LADER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE FRANCIS S.M. HODSOUL, RESIGNED.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD TO BE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT:

GLENAT T. SANCHEZ JENNIFER A. KETCHUM

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL AND THE ASSISTANT JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPECTIVELY, U.S. ARMY, IN THE GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 3037:

*To be the judge advocate general and major general*

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL J. NARDOTTI, JR. xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. ARMY.

*To be the assistant judge advocate general and major general*

BRIG. GEN. KENNETH D. GRAY xxx-xx-x... U.S. ARMY.

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

*To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. DAVID E. FROST, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-x...

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

ALLISON, MATTHEW A.	HOFMEISTER, ELIZABETH M.
AUGE, BRIAN K.	HOFMEISTER, ERIC P.
BALES, LAUREN D.	LYSZCZARZ, JOHN L.
BATSEL, TANIS M.	MCKAY, PATRICIA L.
BECK, TERESA L.	MOUTOUX, PAMELA J.
BONNEMA, CRAIG L.	MULLIGAN, LISA P.
BOYLE, PATRICK K.	MURRAY, DAVID F.
BRETHAUER, STACY A.	NAUGLE, DAVID K.
BUTTOLPH, THOMAS B.	OLSON, PETER H.
CAMPBELL, RICHARD S.	PADGETT, WILLIAM S.
CAPACCHIONE, JOHN F.	PAZOS, GEORGE A.
CARR, DONALD R.	RICCI, ORLANDO
CASH, BROOKS D.	RICE, ROY R.
CHUPP, THOMAS M.	SCHAFER, THEODORE W.
CLEM, JOSEPH B.	SEARS, STEPHEN T.
CRAIG, THOMAS A.	TARVER, JAMES K.
CRONQUIST, STEVEN D.	VALAIKI, DANIEL J.
EDSON, THEODORE D.	VON RIDENAUER, WESLEY B.
ERDMAN, CHARLES W.	WALTERS, KEVIN C.
GARDNER, LINDA M.	WEISTROFFER, JOSEPH K.
GILSTAD, COLLEEN M.	WRIGHT, GREGORY A.
GILSTAD, JOHN R.	
HAMMES, JOHN S.	

RONALD W. THORNTON, AIR FORCE CADET, TO BE PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 541.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED DISTINGUISHED NAVAL GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BURKHARDT, KEITH A. RATKOVIC, CAMERON P.

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY CADETS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 541:

EIMERS, KARL E. ROTH, BLAINE E.  
GARCIA, JACOB L. SMALL, STEPHEN E.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED DISTINGUISHED NAVAL GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

CLARKSON, JEFFREY J.	SANDEN, JEFFREY A.
FRITZ, JOHN E.	THORNBURGH, ROBERT P.
GUSINDE, GREGORY P.	TRAN, DENNIS Q.
KROUSE, JOHN L.	ZEE, NATHANIEL P.
LANE, GEORGE J.	

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BEAN, DANIEL K. TURNER, INGRID M.  
BROWN, KENNETH B.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE) IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531 AND 5582(B):

BOLTON, DAVID A.  
HETTICH, JOSEPH W.

KRUSH, PAUL S.  
MILLER, ROBERT D.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531 AND 5582(B):

ALEXANDER, RAYMOND MCDERMITT, STEPHEN D.  
CAHILL, PETER, J.

CHARLES R. REUNING, U.S. NAVY OFFICER, TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(B).

LYLE W. SWANSON, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICER, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE CHAPLAIN CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531.

WILLIAM H. SIMPSON, LIEUTENANT COLONEL, USAR, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 716.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED MEDICAL COLLEGE GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

HOYT, ROBERT D. OHTAKE, CHIKARA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

ANDERSON, GARELD W.	HARKER, LEE C.
CECIL, JAMES A. II	SHANNON, KEVIN M.
ESCUDEIRO, RONALD J.	SNYDER, JAMES E.
GALLO, JAMES, J.	WATSON, TIMONTHY B.

MARK W. BIOLO, U.S. NAVY OFFICER TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE DENTAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM CANDIDATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE SECTION 531:

ALLENBAUGH, ROGER D.	HOWARD, LYMAN D.
ANDREWS, MICHAEL A.	JOHNSON, CHRISTOPHER T.
ARMSTRONG, CARIN C.	KASE, PHILIP J.
BORDEN, BRADLEY T.	KENDA, DANIEL J.
BOYKIN, ALEXIS K.	LENK, BRIAN S.
BROUSSARD, FREDRICK L.	LONG, JOHN A.
BURKIS, BRENT A.	LOUDENBECK, SCOTT H.
CALDERON, MARK A.	LYONS, JOHN A.
CALLI, TRINA M.	MCDONALD, SEAN P.
CARELLI, PAUL A.	MELSON, MARK A.
COULURIS, JOHN P.	MORONEY, JOHN W.
COWAN, CHRISTOPHER S.	MOSES, KYLE S.
CROXSON, ROBERT D.	MUTCH, JOYCE R.
DEAN, MATTHEW A.	MYERS, COLEY R. III
DESJARDINS, KENNETH T.	NEELY, BRIAN K.
ESH, TIMOTHY D.	NETO, FRANCO F.
GAETA, ROBERT M.	PARNELL, LANCE D.
GILL, PRESTON L.	PATTERSON, JILL M.
GRAY, ARLENE J.	SCHAFF, JOSEPH R.
GRINDLE, MARK C.	SPICER, THEODORE R.
HALL, JAMES T.	STARR, PHILLIP A.
HARRELL, JOHN D.	SULLIVAN, JONATHAN D.
HARRISON, RICHARD K.	TIMMS, RICHARD V.

DOUGLAS B. MCMULLEN, FORMER U.S. NAVY OFFICER TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

ROY E. WEYMOUTH, JR., FORMER U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICER TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

#### IN THE NAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVY ENLISTED COMMISSIONING PROGRAM CANDIDATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BAKER, CHARLES J.	KEANE, KENNETH F.
CARROLL, CARLOS J.	LOKEY, DALE A.
FRETER, JERRY D.	NESSETH, JERRY S.
GEIGER, DANIEL	REGAN, ROBERT J.
GLENN, JAMES R.	RUSH, MARVIN P.
GRESETH, GREGORY J.	STAUFENBERGER, PETER J.
JOHNSON, JOHN R.	THOMPSON, ROBERT W.
JONES, MATTHEW K.	

THE FOLLOWING NAMED DISTINGUISHED NAVAL GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BENNETT, JEFFREY D.	HALL, LANCE C.
BENNETT, WALTER M.	HARTMAN, ANTON J.
BERGEN, CHRISTOPHER	HERMANN, RUSSELL A.
BERRY, WILLIAM G.	JACOBSON, JANET C.
BILLINGSLEY, JON E.	JOHNSON, JEFFREY L.
BUBASH, CHRISTOPHER J.	KARTVEDT, SCOTT A.
CHEUNG, PETER Y.	KELLY, SEAN P.
CUMMINGS, JOHN J.	LEHMAN, MATTHEW J.
GILLAM, HUGH A., JR.	MANEVAL, SHANE W.
GRANT, JEFFREY D.	MARSHALL, SCOTT A.

PAYSEE, JOHN G.  
SCHWARTZ, VICTOR S.  
STURGILL, ERIC D.

VALADEZ, MARC J.  
WESSON, JOHN O.  
WHEELER, MICHAEL D.

JOHN W. DOLLITTLE, AIR FORCE CADET, TO BE PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 541.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BOORDA, ROBERT N. REISMEIER, CHRISTIAN L.  
DUTTON, PETER A. WYNKOOP, TODD A.  
GIROUX, RICHARD K.

PAUL E. MATTHEWS, LIEUTENANT, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY FROM THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1211.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

I NOMINATE THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE FOR APPOINTMENT INTO THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

*To be major*

ERIK M. WOLF xxx-xx-x...

*To be captain*

ROY S. AKANA xxx-xx-x...  
SCOTT F. ANDERSEN xxx-xx-x...  
JAMES A. ARCHER xxx-xx-x...  
JEFFREY K. ARRUDA xxx-xx-x...  
SEAN W. ASH xxx-xx-x...  
DAVID N. ASHEY xxx-xx-x...  
STEPHEN W. AUSTIN xxx-xx-x...  
MARK S. BAGLEY xxx-xx-x...  
GRANT C. BAKLEY xxx-xx-x...  
BRETT D. BARKEY xxx-xx-x...  
VINCENT A. BARR xxx-xx-x...  
BARRY W. BECKNER xxx-xx-x...  
PHILIP J. BETZ, JR. xxx-xx-x...  
MONTE G. BIERSCHEIN xxx-xx-x...  
MICHAEL A. BISZAK xxx-xx-x...  
MICHAEL W. BRELANT xxx-xx-x...  
MARK C. BREWSTER xxx-xx-x...  
MICHAEL S. BUESCH xxx-xx-x...  
GREGORY G. BUTLER xxx-xx-x...  
SCOTT K. CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x...  
GEORGE P. CAULKINS III xxx-xx-x...  
MATTHEW R. CICHOCKI xxx-xx-x...  
NEAL A. CONNORS xxx-xx-x...  
RONALD E. DAHAR xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN P. DANIEL xxx-xx-x...  
PAUL A. DELUCA xxx-xx-x...  
RAYMOND R. DESCHAMPEL xxx-xx-x...  
NORMAND J. DILLON, JR. xxx-xx-x...  
CHESTER C. DOUGLAS III xxx-xx-x...  
BYRON W. DUKE xxx-xx-x...  
TERENCE R. EULINE xxx-xx-x...  
EDWARD I. FARGO xxx-xx-x...  
CHARLES R. FERGUSON III xxx-xx-x...  
FRANCIS S. FERRAR xxx-xx-x...  
CLAYTON J. FISHER xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN H. FREEMAN xxx-xx-x...  
CHARLES J. GOODE III xxx-xx-x...  
AUTHUR P. GOODELL xxx-xx-x...  
SCOTT T. GOWELL xxx-xx-x...  
RICHARD L. GREENWOOD xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN F. HAVRANEK xxx-xx-x...  
KURT A. HELGASON xxx-xx-x...  
WILLIAM L. HOGUE, JR. xxx-xx-x...  
JEFFREY L. HOING xxx-xx-x...  
WAYNE T. ICE xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN M. JANSSEN xxx-xx-x...  
JAMES M. JELLISON xxx-xx-x...  
CHARLES H. JOHNSON III xxx-xx-x...  
SCOTT A. JOHNSTON xxx-xx-x...  
MICHAEL T. KEANE xxx-xx-x...  
KENT J. KEITH xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN F. KENNEDY xxx-xx-x...  
ALAN W. KUBIAK xxx-xx-x...  
TERENCE J. LARKIN xxx-xx-x...  
SAMUEL D. LEE xxx-xx-x...  
JERRY L. LESLIE I xxx-xx-x...  
DEAN F. LEVI xxx-xx-x...  
DUGALD E. MACDONALD xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN F. MARION III xxx-xx-x...  
JOHN P. MARLEY xxx-xx-x...  
NICHOLAS J. MARSHALL xxx-xx-x...  
SCOTT W. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...  
KEITH E. MAYO xxx-xx-x...  
SEAN P. MCBRIDE xxx-xx-x...  
KIRK A. MCDANIEL xxx-xx-x...  
THOMAS W. MCKNIGHT xxx-xx-x...  
KENNETH T. MCQUADE, JR. xxx-xx-x...  
JOSEPH D. MISTRETTA xxx-xx-x...  
MARK W. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...  
MICHAEL E. MOHN xxx-xx-x...  
BARRY J. MOORE xxx-xx-x...  
MARC A. MORENO xxx-xx-x...  
JAMES E. MYERS xxx-xx-x...  
ANDREW D. NABORS xxx-xx-x...  
DALE R. NAJEWSK xxx-xx-x...  
HOWARD W. NELSON xxx-xx-x...  
CHARLES E. NEWTON xxx-xx-x...  
DOUGLAS G. OLBRICH xxx-xx-x...



CHARLES A. PANTEN xxx-xx-x-  
BENTON O. PASCHALL xxx-xx-x-  
LAWRENCE A. PECCATIHELL xxx-xx-x-  
KEN A. PERMANN xxx-xx-x-  
DANNY G. PETERS xxx-xx-x-  
JAMES B. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x-  
RICHARD R. POSEY xxx-xx-x-  
THOMAS R. PROTZELLER xxx-xx-x-  
KEVIN F. REILLY xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL P. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x-  
FRANK A. RICHIE xxx-xx-x-  
MIGUEL A. RIVA xxx-xx-x-  
DANIEL L. ROUSE xxx-xx-x-  
KEVIN D. SAUTTER xxx-xx-x-  
AUSTIN C. SCOGGIN xxx-xx-x-  
ROBERT E. SHELOR xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL G. SHERRILL xxx-xx-x-  
STEVEN J. SINNER xxx-xx-x-  
STUART J. SMITH xxx-xx-x-  
DAVID PAUL H. SNYDER xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL J. SPERRY xxx-xx-x-  
BRADLEY W. STEPHENS xxx-xx-x-  
KIRBY A. STOKES xxx-xx-x-  
DONALD D. TOLBERT, JR. xxx-xx-x-  
ERIC B. TREWORTH xxx-xx-x-  
WILLIAM J. WEISS, JR. xxx-xx-x-  
THOMAS J. WEMBEL xxx-xx-x-  
DAN B. WILLIS xxx-xx-x-  
BILLY G. WILSON xxx-xx-x-  
LAUREL A. WOODS xxx-xx-x-

To be first lieutenant

THOMAS N. AMAN xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL S. ANDERSON xxx-xx-x-  
CHRISTOPHER A. ARANIZ xxx-xx-x-  
CHAD M. BREEDEN xxx-xx-x-  
BRADLEY W. BROWN xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL H. BROWN xxx-xx-x-  
RICKY F. BROWN xxx-xx-x-  
JUSTICE M. CHAMBERS xxx-xx-x-  
JAMES D. CHRISTMAS xxx-xx-x-  
JOHN A. ESQUIVEL xxx-xx-x-  
ANDREW P. FETTER xxx-xx-x-  
PETER D. FOLGER xxx-xx-x-  
THOMAS R. GALLAGHER xxx-xx-x-

VERNON L. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x-  
PHILIP E. GRATHWOL xxx-xx-x-  
GREGORY J. GRINAKER xxx-xx-x-  
DREW A. HANSEN xxx-xx-x-  
KARSTEN S. HECK xxx-xx-x-  
HARRY J. HEWSON, III xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL R. HORROCKS xxx-xx-x-  
JAMES H. HUTCHINS xxx-xx-x-  
TAL H. JACKSON xxx-xx-x-  
DAVID M. JAMES xxx-xx-x-  
DAVID A. JONES xxx-xx-x-  
GARY F. KEIM xxx-xx-x-  
TIMOTHY F. KILBOURNE xxx-xx-x-  
NICHOLAS L. KNIGHT xxx-xx-x-  
TED J. KUHN xxx-xx-x-  
ANDREW J. MACDONALD xxx-xx-x-  
WILLIAM J. MACKAY xxx-xx-x-  
ANDREW G. MANCHICAT xxx-xx-x-  
FRANK N. MCKENZIE xxx-xx-x-  
KEVIN M. MCNERNEY xxx-xx-x-  
KRISTIN L. MOXLEY xxx-xx-x-  
MATTHEW W. NUGENT xxx-xx-x-  
ROBERT E. OGLE xxx-xx-x-  
ALLAN C. ORR, JR. xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL T. REDDING xxx-xx-x-  
WILLIAM L. RUMBLE xxx-xx-x-  
JOSEPH J. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x-  
JAMES B. SCHAFFER xxx-xx-x-  
JOEL T. SCHIRO xxx-xx-x-  
JOSEPH F. SHRADE xxx-xx-x-  
NICHOLAS A. SPIGNES xxx-xx-x-  
TODD T. STATLEY xxx-xx-x-  
DENNIS R. STEPHENS xxx-xx-x-  
CURTIS A. STRADER xxx-xx-x-  
MARK A. SUHRE xxx-xx-x-  
DENNIS F. SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x-  
MARK S. SZARMACH xxx-xx-x-  
JONATHAN S. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x-  
BRADLEY A. TIELBUR xxx-xx-x-  
EDWARD C. TIERNEY xxx-xx-x-  
WILLIAM A. TOSICK xxx-xx-x-  
TROY A. TOTH xxx-xx-x-  
ROGER B. TURLEY xxx-xx-x-  
JOHN S. WEDEMEYER xxx-xx-x-  
CHARLES A. WESTER xxx-xx-x-  
HUGH A. WORDEN xxx-xx-x-

To be second lieutenant

MICHAEL N. BERT xxx-xx-x-  
FORREST D. DODD xxx-xx-x-  
RICHARD K. HALSTED xxx-xx-x-  
SCOTT M. MAROSEK xxx-xx-x-  
MICHAEL D. MCGRATH xxx-xx-x-  
STEVEN J. METELAK xxx-xx-x-  
JEROME P. RIZZO xxx-xx-x-  
KURT J. SIGLIN xxx-xx-x-  
TIMOTHY C. ZLOTNICKI xxx-xx-x-

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS FOR APPOINTMENT AND DESIGNATION AS UNRESTRICTED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5589:

To be captain

RONNIE L. PATRICK xxx-xx-x-  
HOWARD A. WATT xxx-xx-x-

To be first lieutenant

HERMAN L. BARNES, JR. xxx-xx-x-  
JOHN M. CHADWICK xxx-xx-x-  
MARK A. MCGUIRE xxx-xx-x-

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, OF COLORADO, TO BE COUNSELOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.  
WINSTON LORD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.  
THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.